arXiv:0712.4094v1 [math.RA] 26 Dec 2007

TWISTED PLANES

JORGE A. GUCCIONE, JUAN J. GUCCIONE, AND CHRISTIAN VALQUI

Abstract. Let k be a commutative ring. We find and characterize a new family of twisted planes (i. e. associative unitary k-algebra structures on the k-module $k[X,Y]$, having $k[X]$ and $k[Y]$ as subalgebras). Similar results are obtained for the k-module of two variables power series $k[[X,Y]]$.

Introduction

Let k be a commutative ring and let A, B be unitary k-algebras. By definition, a twisted tensor product of A with B (over k) is an algebra structure defined on $A \otimes_k B$, with unit $1 \otimes_k 1$, such that the canonical maps $i_A\colon A \to A \otimes_k B$ and $i_B\colon B \to A \otimes_k B$ are algebra maps satisfying $a \otimes b = i_A(a) i_B(b)$. This structure has been formerly studied by many people with different motivations (see for instance [Ca], [C-S-V], [G-G], [Ma], [Tam], [VD-VK]). On one hand it is the most general solution to the problem of factorization of structures in the setting of associative algebras. Consequently, a number of examples of classical and recently defined constructions in ring theory fits into this construction. For instance, Ore extensions, skew group algebras, smash products, etcetera (for the definition and properties of these structures we refer to [Mo] and [Ka]). On the other hand it has been proposed as the natural representative for the cartesian product of nonconmutative spaces, this being based on the existing duality between the categories of algebraic affine spaces and commutative algebras, under which the cartesian product of spaces corresponds to the tensor product of algebras. And last, but not least, twisted tensor products arise as a tool for building algebras starting with simpler ones.

Given algebras A and B, a basic problem is to determine all the twisted tensor products of A with B and classify them up to a natural equivalence relation. A *(noncommutative) polynomial extension* of a k-algebra B is a twisted tensor product of a polynomial ring $k[Y]$ with B. A *twisted plane* is such an extension in which B is also a polynomial algebra $k[X]$. That is, an associative unitary algebra C, with underlying k-module $k[X,Y]$, such that:

- the natural inclusions $i_{k[X]}\colon k[X] \to C$ and $i_{k[Y]}\colon k[Y] \to C$ are algebra maps,
- $i_{k[X]}(X^m) i_{k[Y]}(Y^n) = X^m Y^n$ for each $n, m \geq 0$.

For instance, Ore extensions of $k[Y]$ are examples of twisted planes. The aim of this paper is to begin the study of these extensions, with emphasis in the problem of the classification of the twisted planes. Actually, we do not solve completely this problem in the present work, but we give the first step on having found and characterized a new family of twisted planes. Besides the twisted polynomial extensions, in this article we also consider twisted extensions of the power series ring

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16W35; 81R60.

Supported by UBACYT 0294 and PIP 5617 (CONICET).
Supported by UBACYT 0294 and PIP 5617 (CONICET).
Supported by PUCP-DAI-3490.

$k[[X]]$, finding a new family of twisted tensor products of $k[[X]]$ with $k[[Y]]$. Indeed, the natural setting to deal with adelically complete algebras such as $k[[X]]$ is the monoidal category of filtered k-modules which are complete with respect to the induced topology. Consequently, in this case we look for adelically complete algebras C, with underlying topological k-module $k[[X,Y]]$, such that:

- the natural inclusions $i_{k[[X]]}\colon k[[X]]\to C$ and $i_{k[[Y]]}\colon k[[Y]]\to C$ are continuos algebra maps,
- $i_{k[[X]]}(X^m)i_{k[[Y]]}(Y^n)=X^mY^n$ for each $n,m\ge 0$.

From now on we assume implicitly that all the maps are k-linear maps, all the algebras are over k, and the tensor product over k is denoted $\otimes$, without any subscript.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 1 we have compiled without proofs some of the standard facts on twisted tensor products, thus making our exposition self-contained. In particular we recall the definition of a twisting map $s\colon A\otimes B\to B\otimes A$ and we establish the bijective correspondence $s\mapsto B\otimes_s A$ between twisting maps and twisted tensor products. We also set up notation and terminology. In Section 2 we begin the study of the noncommutative polynomial extensions. Consider an algebra A and maps $\alpha_j\colon A\to A$ $(j\ge 0)$. In Theorem 2.1, we determine necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a (necessarily unique) twisting map $s\colon k[Y]\otimes A\to A\otimes k[Y]$ such that

$$s(Y\otimes a)=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\alpha_j(a)\otimes Y^j.$$

When $\alpha_j=0$ for all $j\ge 2$, then we reobtain the familiar conditions to build an Ore extension of A. That is, α_1 must be an algebra endomorphism and α_0 must be an (α_1,id)-derivation. After that we give several examples, and later on, in Theorem 2.7 and Corollary 2.8, we establish a method to construct a twisting map with $\alpha_0=0$ and $\alpha_1=\mathsf{id}$ beginning with a locally nilpotent derivation. Section 3 is devoted to the study of twisted planes. Theorem 3.1 and 3.4 are two of the main results of this paper. Applying them, in Corollary 3.6 we obtain all the twisting maps

$$s\colon k[Y]\otimes k[X]\to k[X]\otimes k[Y]$$

such that $\alpha_0=0$, α_1 is the evaluation at an element of k and $\{n:\alpha_n\ne 0\}$ is finite. The aim of Section 4 is to determine all the twisting maps

$$s\colon k[Y]\otimes k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle\to k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle\otimes k[Y].$$

To do this we first study the twisted tensor products $k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle\otimes_s A$, then we consider in detail the case $A=k[Y]$, and use that s is a twisting map if and only if $\tau\circ s\circ\tau$ is, where τ denotes the flip. Finally, in Section 5 we begin the study of the twisted tensor products of the power series ring $k[[Y]]$ with an algebra A, in the monoidal category of complete filtered k-modules. In this case, each map

$$s\colon k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}A\to A\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$$

(where $\hat{\otimes}$ denotes the completed tensor product over k) is also determined by a family of maps $\alpha_j\colon A\to A$ $(j\ge 0)$, but the conditions that these maps must satisfy to guarantee that s is a twisting map, which are found in Theorem 5.3, are somewhat different from those required when dealing with noncommutative polynomial extensions. In Theorem 5.4 we give a version for complete algebras of Theorem 2.7, but the main result of this section, and one of the main results of the paper, is Theorem 5.6, in which we obtain all the twisting maps

$$s\colon k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}A\to A\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$$

with $\alpha_0 = 0$.

Acknowledgment. This research was began during a visit of the first two authors to the "IMCA" and the "PUCP". They specially thank to these institutions for their hospitality and support during their visit. We also thank Professor Guillermo Cortiñas for useful comments.

1. Preliminaries

In this section we review some of the basic facts about twisted tensor products. For their proofs we refer to [C-S-V], [VD-VK] and [C-I-M-Z]. Given an algebra A we let η_A and μ_A denote the unit and the multiplication maps of A, respectively.

Let A and B be algebras. A *twisted tensor product* of A with B is an algebra structure on the k-module $A \otimes B$, such that the canonical maps

$$i_A \colon A \to A \otimes B \quad \text{and} \quad i_B \colon B \to A \otimes B$$

are algebra homomorphisms and $\mu\circ(i_A \otimes i_B) = \mathsf{id}_{A\otimes B}$, where μ denotes the multiplication map of the twisted tensor product.

Assume we have a tensor product of A with B. Then, the map

$$s \colon B \otimes A \to A \otimes B,$$

define by $s := \mu\circ(i_B \otimes i_A)$, satisfies:

1. $s\circ(\eta_B \otimes A) = A \otimes \eta_B$ and $s\circ(B \otimes \eta_A) = \eta_A \otimes B$,
2. $s\circ(\mu_B \otimes A) = (A \otimes \mu_B)\circ(s \otimes B)\circ(B \otimes s)$,
3. $s\circ(B \otimes \mu_A) = (\mu_A \otimes B)\circ(A \otimes s)\circ(s \otimes A)$.

A map satisfying these conditions is call a *twisting map.* Conversely, if

$$s \colon B \otimes A \to A \otimes B$$

is a twisting map, then $A \otimes B$ becomes a twisted tensor product via

$$\mu_s := (\mu_A \otimes \mu_B)\circ(A \otimes s \otimes B).$$

This algebra will be denoted $A \otimes_s B$. Furthermore, these constructions are inverse one of each other.

The twisted tensor product $A \otimes_s B$ has the following universal property: Given algebra maps $f \colon A \to C$ and $g \colon B \to C$ such that

$$\mu_C\circ(g \otimes f) = \mu_C\circ(f \otimes g)\circ s,$$

there is a unique morphism of algebras $h \colon A \otimes_s B \to C$ satisfying

$$f = h\circ i_A \qquad \text{and} \qquad g = h\circ i_B.$$

Indeed, it is easy to check that $h = \mu_C\circ(f \otimes g)$.

The twisting maps are the objects of a category. Let $s \colon B \otimes A \to A \otimes B$ and $t \colon D \otimes C \to C \otimes D$ be twisting maps. A morphism $(f, g) \colon s \to t$ is a pair of morphism of algebras $f \colon A \to C$ and $g \colon B \to D$ such that

$$t\circ(g \otimes f) = (f \otimes g)\circ s.$$

The composition is the evident one. Two twisting maps $s, t \colon B \otimes A \to A \otimes B$ are said to be *equivalent* if they are isomorphic. That is, if there exist automorphisms $f \colon A \to A$ and $g \colon B \to B$ such that $t = (f^{-1} \otimes g^{-1})\circ s\circ(g \otimes f)$.

The following result is useful to check that a map $s \colon B \otimes A \to A \otimes B$ is a twisting map, and will be used implicitly in this paper.

Proposition 1.1. *Let* $s\colon B\otimes A \to A\otimes B$ *be a map satisfying conditions (1) and (2). If* $(b_i)_{i\in I}$ *generates* B *as an algebra and*

$$s(b_i \otimes aa') = (\mu_A \otimes B)\circ(A\otimes s)\circ(s\otimes A)(b_i \otimes a \otimes a')$$

for all $a, a' \in A$ *and each index* i*, then* s *is a twisting map.*

In the last section of this paper we will consider twisting maps between complete filtrated algebras. Hence, we will work in the monoidal category CMod, of complete filtrated k-modules, where k is a commutative ring. An object of CMod is a k-module M endowed with a filtration

$$M = M_0 \supseteq M_1 \supseteq M_2 \supseteq \cdots,$$

such that each M_i is a k-module and M is complete with respect to the topology induced by the filtration. A morphism in CMod is a continuous map $f\colon M \to N$ (namely, a map f satisfying the requirement that for each $i \geq 0$ there exists n_i such that $f(M_{n_i}) \subseteq N_i$). The tensor product of M with N in CMod, denoted by $M\hat{\otimes}N$, is the completation of the usual tensor product $M\otimes N$, with respect to the topology induced by the filtration

$$(M\otimes N)_i = \sum_{r+s=i} \jmath(M_r \otimes N_s),$$

where $\jmath\colon M_r \otimes N_s \to M\otimes N$ is the canonical map.

Standard modules are considered as objects of CMod via the filtration

$$M = M_0 \supseteq 0 = 0 = \cdots \quad (M_i = 0 \text{ for all } i > 0).$$

The power series ring $k[[Y]]$ is an algebra in CMod via the usual filtration

$$k[[Y]] = K[[Y]] \supseteq Yk[[Y]] \supseteq Y^2k[[Y]] \supseteq \cdots.$$

Moreover, the completed tensor product $k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}M$ is canonically isomorphic to $M[[Y]]$, for each standard module M.

All the discussion preceding Proposition 1.1 is valid for arbitrary monoidal categories.

2. Non-commutative polynomial extensions

This section is devoted to the study of the twisting maps $k[Y]\otimes A \to A\otimes k[Y]$, where A is an arbitrary algebra. Given a family of maps $(\alpha_j\colon A \to A)_{j\geq 0}$ and indices $n_1,\dots,n_r \geq 0$, we set $|n_1,\dots,n_r| = n_1+\cdots+n_r$ and $\alpha_{n_1\dots n_r} = \alpha_{n_1}\circ\cdots\circ\alpha_{n_r}$. Moreover we write

$$\gamma_j^{(0)} = \delta_{0j}\,\mathsf{id} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_j^{(r)} = \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r|=j} \alpha_{n_1\dots n_r} \text{ for } r>0.$$

Note that $\gamma_j^{(1)} = \alpha_j$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let* A *be an algebra and* $s\colon k[Y]\otimes A \to A\otimes k[Y]$ *a twisting map. The equation*

$$s(Y\otimes a) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j(a)\otimes Y^j,$$

defines a family of maps $\alpha_j\colon A \to A$*, which satisfies:*

1. *For each* $a\in A$ *there exists* $j_0 \geq 0$*, such that* $\alpha_j(a) = 0$ *whenever* $j > j_0$*.*
2. $\alpha_j(1) = \delta_{j1}$*, where* δ_{j1} *denotes the symbol of Kronecker.*

(3) *For all* $j \geq 0$ *and all* $a, b \in A$,

$$\alpha_j(ab) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \alpha_r(a)\gamma_j^{(r)}(b). \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover,

$$s(Y^r \otimes a) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_j^{(r)}(a) \otimes Y^j \tag{2.2}$$

for all $r \geq 0$ *and* $a \in A$. *Conversely, given maps* $\alpha_j \colon A \to A$ *(*$j \geq 0$*) satisfying (1)–(3), the formula* (2.2) *defines a twisting map.*

Proof. Let s be a twisting map. The formula for $s(Y^r \otimes a)$ can be checked easily by induction on r, using that $s(1 \otimes a) = a \otimes 1$ and the compatibility of s with the multiplication of $k[Y]$. Item (1) is immediate and items (2) and (3) are consequences of the compatibility of s with the unit and the multiplication of A. Conversely, assume we have a family of maps $(\alpha_j)_{j \geq 0}$ satisfying (1), (2) and (3). Let

$$f \colon A[Y] \to A[Y]$$

be the map given by $f(aY^j) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \alpha_i(a) Y^{i+j}$, which is well defined by (1). Since $f^r(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_j^{(r)}(a) Y^j$ and obviously $f^r(a) \in A[Y]$, for each $a \in A$ and $r > 0$, there exists $n \geq 0$ such that $\gamma_j^{(r)}(a) = 0$ whenever $j > n$. This establishes the well-definition of formula (2.2). We leave the proof that s is a twisting map to the reader. □

Remark 2.2. If $s \colon k[Y] \otimes A \to A \otimes k[Y]$ is a twisting map, then $\ker(\alpha_0)$ is a subalgebra of A. Moreover,

- If $\alpha_0 = 0$, then α_1 is a endomorphism of algebras.
- Let $\nu > 1$. If $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\alpha_j = 0$ for $1 < j < \nu$, then
$$\alpha_\nu(ab) = \alpha_1(a)\alpha_\nu(b) + \alpha_\nu(a)\alpha_1^\nu(b).$$

Example 2.3. If $\alpha \colon A \to A$ is an algebra endomorphism and $\delta \colon A \to A$ is an α-derivation (that is $\delta(ab) = \delta(a)b + \alpha(a)\delta(b)$), then there is a unique twisting map $s \colon k[Y] \otimes A \to A \otimes k[Y]$ such that

$$s(Y \otimes a) = \alpha(a) \otimes Y + \delta(a) \otimes 1 \quad \text{for all } a \in A.$$

Example 2.4. Let $A = k[t]/\langle t^2 \rangle$. Consider the family of maps $(\alpha_j \colon A \to A)_{j \geq 0}$, defined by

$$\alpha_0 = 0, \quad \alpha_1 = \mathsf{id}, \quad \alpha_2(\lambda + \mu t) = \mu t \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_j = 0 \text{ for } j > 2.$$

The formula $s(Y \otimes a) = \alpha_1(a) \otimes Y + \alpha_2(a) \otimes Y^2$ defines a twisting map.

Let $\alpha \colon A \to A$ be an algebra automorphism and let $(\beta_i \colon A \to A)_{i \geq 1}$ be a family of maps. For $i_1, \dots, i_l \geq 1$, let

$$\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)} = \beta_{i_1} \circ \alpha^{-1} \circ \beta_{i_2} \circ \alpha^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{i_{l-2}} \circ \alpha^{-1} \circ \beta_{i_{l-1}} \circ \alpha^{-1} \circ \beta_{i_l}$$

Note that $\beta_{(i)} = \beta_i$. If $i_1, \dots, i_l = 1$ we will write $\beta_{(1)}^{(l)}$ instead of $\beta_{(1,\dots,1)}$. In particular $\beta_{(1)}^{(1)} = \beta_{(1)} = \beta_1$. We also write $\beta_{(1)}^{(0)} = \alpha$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let* $(\alpha_j \colon A \to A)_{j \geq 0}$ *be the family of maps defined by* $\alpha_0 = 0$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha$ *and*

$$\alpha_j = \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l| = j-1} \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)} \qquad \text{for } j \geq 2.$$

Then, for all $j \ge r$,

$$\gamma_j^{(r)} = L + \sum_{\substack{n_1,\dots n_r \ge 0\\ |n_1,\dots,n_r| = j-r}} \beta_{(1)}^{(n_1)} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)},$$

where L is sum of compositions of α's, α^{-1}'s and β_i's, in which at least one β_i with $i > 1$, appears.

Proof. Since

$$\alpha_j = \beta_1^{(j-1)} + \sum_{l=1}^{j-2} \sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l| = j-1} \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)} \qquad \text{for all } j \ge 1,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_j^{(r)} &= \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r| = j} \alpha_{n_1 \dots n_r}\\ &= L + \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r| = j} \beta_{(1)}^{(n_1-1)} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{(1)}^{(n_r-1)},\\ &= L + \sum_{\substack{n_1,\dots n_r \ge 0\\ |n_1,\dots,n_r| = j-r}} \beta_{(1)}^{(n_1)} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)},\end{aligned}$$

as desired. ☐

Let A be an algebra and φ, ψ endomorphisms of A. Recall that a map $d\colon A \to A$ is a (φ, ψ)-derivation if

$$d(ab) = d(a)\psi(b) + \varphi(a)d(b) \text{ for all } a, b \in A.$$

Lemma 2.6. *For each $i \ge 1$, let $\beta_i\colon A \to A$ be an (α, α^{i+1})-derivation. Assume that if $i + i' \ge 3$, then $\alpha^r(\beta_i(a))\beta_{i'}(b) = 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a, b \in A$. We have:*

1. *$\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)L(b) = 0$, where L is as in Lemma 2.5.*
2. *If some $i_u > 1$ and some $n_v > 0$, then*
$$\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)\alpha^h \circ \beta_1(b) = \alpha^h \circ \beta_1(a)\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(b) = 0.$$
3. *If some $i_u > 1$, then*
$$\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)} \text{ is an } (\alpha, \alpha^j)\text{-derivation,}$$
where $j = 1 + i_1 + \cdots + i_l$.

Proof. (1) let $f_1 \circ \cdots \circ f_v$, where $f_i = \{\alpha, \alpha^{-1}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots\}$ be a term of L. Let i_0 be the least i such that $f_i = \beta_j$ with $j > 1$. By definition $\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a) = \beta_{i_1}(a')$, where $a' = \alpha^{-1}(\beta_{(i_2,\dots,i_l)}(a))$. If $i_0 = 1$, then

$$\beta_{i_1}(a')\bigl(f_1 \circ \cdots \circ f_v(b)\bigr) = 0,$$

by hypothesis. The general case follows by induction on i_0 using that if $f_1 = \alpha^{\pm 1}$, then

$$\beta_{i_1}(a') f_1 \circ \cdots \circ f_v(b) = f_1\Bigl(f_1^{-1} \circ \beta_{i_1}(a') f_2 \circ \cdots \circ f_v(b)\Bigr)$$

and if $f_1 = \beta_1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{i_1}(a') f_1 \circ \cdots \circ f_v(b) &= \beta_1\Bigl(\alpha^{-1} \circ \beta_{i_1}(a') f_2 \circ \cdots \circ f_v(b)\Bigr)\\ &\quad + \alpha^2\Bigl(\alpha^{-2} \circ \beta_1 \circ \alpha^{-1} \circ \beta_{i_1}(a') f_2 \circ \cdots \circ f_v(b)\Bigr).\end{aligned}$$

(2) It is similar to (1).

(3) We make the proof by induction on l. First assume that $u>1$. Then, by the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(ab) &= \beta_{i_1}\circ\alpha^{-1}\circ\beta_{(i_2,\dots,i_l)}(ab)\\ &= \beta_{i_1}\circ\alpha^{-1}\Big(\beta_{(i_2,\dots,i_l)}(a)\alpha^{1+i_2+\cdots+i_l}(b)+\alpha(a)\beta_{(i_2,\dots,i_l)}(b)\Big)\\ &= \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)\alpha^{1+i_1+\cdots+i_l}(b)+\beta_{(i_2,\dots,i_l)}(a)\beta_{i_1}\circ\alpha^{i_2+\cdots+i_l}(b)\\ &\quad+\beta_{i_1}(a)\alpha^{i_1}\circ\beta_{(i_2,\dots,i_l)}(b)+\alpha(a)\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(b)\\ &= \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)\alpha^{1+i_1+\cdots+i_l}(b)+\alpha(a)\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(b),\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that, by item (2),

$$\beta_{(i_2,\dots,i_l)}(a)\beta_{i_1}\circ\alpha^{i_2+\cdots+i_l}(b)=\beta_{i_1}(a)\alpha^{i_1}\circ\beta_{(i_2,\dots,i_l)}(b)=0.$$

Assume now that $u=1$. Then, arguing as above we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(ab) &= \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_{l-1})}\circ\alpha^{-1}\circ\beta_{i_l}(ab)\\ &= \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)\alpha^{1+i_1+\cdots+i_l}(b)+\alpha(a)\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(b),\end{aligned}$$

as desired. ☐

Theorem 2.7. *Let* $\alpha\colon A\to A$ *be an algebra automorphism. For each* $i\ge 1$*, let* $\beta_i\colon A\to A$ *be an* (α,α^{i+1})*-derivation. If*

(1) $\alpha^r(\beta_i(a))\beta_{i'}(b)=0$ *for all* $r\in\mathbb{Z}$ *and* $a,b\in A$ *whenever* $i+i'\ge 3$,

(2) *For all* $a\in A$ *there is* $n\in\mathbb{N}$ *such that*

$$\sum_{l=1}^{j}\sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l|=j}\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)=0\quad\text{for all } j>n,$$

then, the formula

$$s(Y\otimes a)=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\alpha_j(a)\otimes Y^j,$$

where the maps $\alpha_j\colon A\to A$ $(j\ge 0)$ *are constructed as in Lemma 2.5, defines a twisting map* $s\colon k[Y]\otimes A\to A\otimes k[Y]$.

Proof. By item (2), the maps α_j satisfy condition (1) of Theorem 2.1. Condition (2) follows from the fact that the β_i's are derivations. It remains to check that condition (3) also holds. For $j\le 1$ this is immediate. Assume $j\ge 2$ and set

$$T=\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}\alpha_r(a)\gamma_j^{(r)}(b).$$

On one hand, by Lemma 2.5 and 2.6,

$$\begin{aligned}T&=\sum_{r=1}^{j}\alpha_r(a)\gamma_j^{(r)}(b)\\ &=\alpha_1(a)\gamma_j^{(1)}(b)+\alpha_j(a)\gamma_j^{(j)}(b)+\sum_{r=2}^{j-1}\alpha_r(a)\gamma_j^{(r)}(b)\\ &=\sum_{l=1}^{j-1}\sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l|=j-1}\alpha(a)\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(b)+\sum_{l=1}^{j-1}\sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l|=j-1}\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)\alpha^j(b)\\ &\quad+\sum_{r=2}^{j-1}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{r-1}\sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l|=r-1}\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)\right)\left(L(b)+\sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r|=j-r}\beta_{(1)}^{(n_1)}\circ\cdots\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)}(b)\right)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l|=j-1} \alpha(a)\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(b) + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l|=j-1} \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)\alpha^j(b)\\
&+ \sum_{r=2}^{j-1} \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r|=j-r} \beta_{(1)}^{(r-1)}(a)\beta_{(1)}^{(n_1)}\circ\cdots\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)}(b).
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, since by item (3) of Lemma 2.6, $\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}$ is an (α,α^j)-derivation whenever some $i_u > 1$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha_j(ab) &= \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l|=j-1} \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(ab)\\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{j-2} \sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_l|=j-1} \Bigl(\alpha(a)\beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(b) + \beta_{(i_1,\dots,i_l)}(a)\alpha^j(b)\Bigr) + \beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(ab).
\end{aligned}
$$

So, in order to finish the proof it suffices to show that for all $j \ge 2$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(ab) &= \alpha(a)\beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(b) + \beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(a)\alpha^j(b)\\
&\quad + \sum_{r=2}^{j-1} \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r|=j-r} \beta_{(1)}^{(r-1)}(a)\beta_{(1)}^{(n_1)}\circ\cdots\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)}(b).
\end{aligned}
$$

We proceed by induction on j. When $j = 2$,

$$
\beta_{(1)}^{(1)}(ab) = \beta_1(ab) = \alpha(a)\beta_1(b) + \beta_1(a)\alpha^2(b),
$$

since β_1 is an (α,α^2)-derivation. Assume that the result is valid for j. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{(1)}^{(j)}(ab) &= \beta_1\circ\alpha^{-1}\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(ab)\\
&= \beta_1\left(a\alpha^{-1}\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(b)\right) + \beta_1\left(\alpha^{-1}\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(a)\alpha^{j-1}(b)\right)\\
&+ \beta_1\left(\sum_{r=2}^{j-1} \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r|=j-r} \alpha^{-1}\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(r-1)}(a)\alpha^{-1}\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_1)}\circ\cdots\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)}(b)\right)\\
&= \alpha(a)\beta_{(1)}^{(j)}(b) + \beta_{(1)}^{(j)}(a)\alpha^{j+1}(b)\\
&+ \beta_1(a)\alpha\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(b) + \beta_{(1)}^{(j-1)}(a)\beta_1\circ\alpha^{j-1}(b)\\
&+ \sum_{r=2}^{j-1} \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r|=j-r} \beta_{(1)}^{(r)}(a)\alpha\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_1)}\circ\cdots\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)}(b)\\
&+ \sum_{r=2}^{j-1} \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r|=j-r} \beta_{(1)}^{(r-1)}(a)\beta_{(1)}^{(n_1+1)}\circ\cdots\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)}(b)\\
&= \alpha(a)\beta_{(1)}^{(j)}(b) + \beta_{(1)}^{(j)}(a)\alpha^{j+1}(b)\\
&+ \sum_{r=2}^{j} \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_r|=j+1-r} \beta_{(1)}^{(r-1)}(a)\beta_{(1)}^{(n_1)}\circ\cdots\circ\beta_{(1)}^{(n_r)}(b).
\end{aligned}
$$

This finish the proof. □

Corollary 2.8. *Let A be an algebra, $\alpha\colon A \to A$ be an algebra automorphism and $\beta\colon A \to A$ be an (α,α^2)-derivation. Let $(\alpha_j\colon A \to A)_{j\ge 0}$ be the family of maps defined by $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\alpha_j = \bigl(\beta\circ\alpha^{-1}\bigr)^{j-2}\circ\beta$ for $j \ge 1$. If $\beta\circ\alpha^{-1}$ is locally nilpotent* *(that is, for each $a \in A$ there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $\left(\beta \circ \alpha^{-1}\right)^n(a) = 0$), then the formula*

$$s(Y \otimes a) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j(a) \otimes Y^j$$

defines a twisting map $s\colon k[Y] \otimes A \to A \otimes k[Y]$.

Proof. Take $\beta_1 = \beta$ and $\beta_j = 0$ for $j > 1$ in Theorem 2.7. ☐

Example 2.9. Let $A = k[t]/\langle t^n \rangle$. Let $D\colon A \to A$ be the derivation defined by $D(P)(t) = P'(t)t^2$. The formula

$$s(Y \otimes P) = P \otimes Y + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} D^j(P) \otimes Y^{j+1}$$

defines a twisting map $s\colon k[Y] \otimes A \to A \otimes k[Y]$.

3. Twisted planes

The aim of this section is to study in detail the twisting maps

$$s\colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y].$$

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\sum_{ij} q_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j \in k[X] \otimes k[Y]$. If $q_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \leq 1$ or $j \leq 1$, then there is a unique twisting map $s\colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y]$ such that $s(Y \otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j$. Moreover $s(Y^r \otimes X^s) = 0$ whenever $r, s > 0$ and $r + s > 2$.*

Proof. First we assume that a such twisting map exists and we prove that it satisfies $s(Y^r \otimes X^s) = 0$ if $r, s > 0$ and $r + s > 2$. Let $(\alpha_j)_{j \geq 0}$ be as in Theorem 2.1. So, $\alpha_j(X) = \sum_i q_{ij} X^i$. The hypothesis means that $\alpha_0(X) = \alpha_1(X) = 0$ and $\alpha_j(X) \in X^2 k[X]$ for each $j \geq 2$. Consequently, by Remark 2.2, $\alpha_0 = 0$ and α_1 is the evaluation at 0. We assert that $\alpha_j(X^n) = 0$ for each $j \geq 0$ and $n \geq 2$. For $j = 0, 1$ this is clear. Assume $\alpha_l(X^n) = 0$ for all $l < j$ and $n \geq 2$. Then, by item (3) of Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\alpha_j(X^2) = \sum_{r=2}^{j} \alpha_r(X) \gamma_j^{(r)}(X),$$

which vanishes, because clearly $\alpha_{n_1 \dots n_r}(X) = 0$ if $n_r \leq 1$, and also if $n_r \geq 2$ since, in this case, $\alpha_{n_r}(X) \in X^2 k[X]$ and $n_{r-1} < j$. Assuming now that $n \geq 3$ and $\alpha_j(X^n) = 0$, using again item (3) of Theorem 2.1, we obtain

$$\alpha_j(X^n) = \sum_{r=2}^{j} \alpha_r(X^2) \gamma_j^{(r)}(X^{n-2}) = 0.$$

It is now easy to check that $s(Y^r \otimes X^s) = 0$ whenever $r, s > 0$ and $r + s > 2$, as wanted. Finally, to check the existence of s, it suffices to note that the family of maps $(\alpha_j\colon A \to A)_{j \geq 0}$, defined by $\alpha_0 = 0$, $\alpha_1(X^n) = \delta_{1n}$ and

$$\alpha_j(X^n) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i \geq 0} q_{ij} X^i & \text{if } n = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $j \geq 2$ satisfies the conditions required in Theorem 2.1. We leave the details to the reader. ☐

Definition 3.2. A twisting map $s\colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y]$ is *upper bounded* if there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha_n = 0$ for all $n \geq n_0$. It is *lower bounded* if $\tau \circ s \circ \tau$ is upper bounded, where τ denotes the flip. Finally, we say that s is *bounded* if it is upper and lower bounded.

Example 3.3. Twisting maps associated with Ore extensions $k[X][Y,\alpha,\delta]$ are upper bounded, but in general they are not lower bounded. The twisting maps introduced in Theorem 3.1 are bounded.

By the sake of continuity the proof of the following result is relegated to an appendix.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume that k is a commutative domain. Let*

$$\sum_{ij} q_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j \in k[X] \otimes k[Y].$$

The following facts hold:

1. *If $q_{i0} = q_{i1} = 0$ for all $i \geq 0$ and there is a (necessarily unique) upper bounded twisting map $s\colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y]$ such that*

   $$s(Y \otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j,$$

   then $q_{0j} = q_{1j} = 0$ for all $j \geq 0$.
2. *If $q_{0j} = q_{1j} = 0$ for all $j \geq 0$ and there is a (necessarily unique) lower bounded twisting map $s\colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y]$ such that*

   $$s(Y \otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j,$$

   then $q_{i0} = q_{i1} = 0$ for all $i \geq 0$.

We say that a twisting map $s\colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y]$ is *almost null* if it is equivalent (in the sense introduced above Proposition 1.1) to one of the twisting maps considered in Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.5. *Assume that k is a commutative domain. Let*

$$\sum_{ij} q'_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j \in k[X] \otimes k[Y].$$

Consider the polynomials

$$P_i(Z) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q'_{in} Z^n \quad \text{and} \quad Q_j(Z) = \sum_{m\geq 0} q'_{mj} Z^m \qquad (i,j \geq 0).$$

The following facts hold:

1. *There is an almost null twisting map $s'\colon k[X] \otimes k[Y] \to k[Y] \otimes k[X]$ such that*

   $$s'(Y \otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q'_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j,$$

   if and only if there exist $\lambda, \xi \in k$ satisfying:

   (a) *$P_0(\xi) = 0$, $P_1(\xi) = \xi$, $P'_0(\xi) = \lambda$, $P'_1(\xi) = 0$ and ξ is multiple root of $P_i(Z)$ for each $i > 1$.*

   and

   (b) *$Q_0(\lambda) = 0$, $Q_1(\lambda) = \lambda$, $Q'_0(\lambda) = \xi$, $Q'_1(\lambda) = 0$ and λ is multiple root of $Q_j(Z)$ for each $j > 1$.*

   Moreover, the equivalence $s' \simeq s$ is realized by means of the automorphisms

   $$f\colon k[Y] \to k[Y] \quad \text{and} \quad g\colon k[X] \to k[X],$$

   defined by $f(Y) = Y - \xi$ and $g(X) = X - \lambda$.

(2) *If there exist* $\lambda, \xi \in k$ *that satisfy item (a), but not item (b), then there is not an upper bounded twisting map* $s'\colon k[Y]\otimes k[X] \to k[X]\otimes k[Y]$ *such that*

$$s'(Y\otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q'_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j.$$

(3) *If there exist* $\lambda, \xi \in k$ *that satisfy item (b), but not item (a), then there is not a lower bounded twisting map* $s'\colon k[Y]\otimes k[X] \to k[X]\otimes k[Y]$ *such that*

$$s'(Y\otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q'_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j.$$

Proof. It is easy to check that $s'\colon k[Y]\otimes k[X] \to k[X]\otimes k[Y]$ is an almost null twisting map if and only if there exist $\lambda, \xi \in k$ such that

$$s = (g^{-1}\otimes f^{-1})\circ s' \circ (f\otimes g)$$

satisfies the conditions required in Theorem 3.1, where

$$f\colon k[Y]\to k[Y] \quad \text{and} \quad g\colon k[X]\to k[X]$$

are the automorphisms defined by $f(Y) = Y-\xi$ and $g(X) = X-\lambda$. Write

$$s(Y\otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q_{ij} X^i\otimes Y^j \qquad \text{and} \qquad s'(Y\otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q'_{ij} X^i\otimes Y^j.$$

A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} s(Y\otimes X) &= \big((g^{-1}\otimes f^{-1})\circ s'\circ(f\otimes g)\big)(x\otimes X)\\ &= \sum_{ij}\Bigg(\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty}\binom{m}{i}\binom{n}{j}\lambda^{m-i}\xi^{n-j}q'_{mn}\Bigg)X^i\otimes Y^j - X\otimes\xi - \lambda\otimes Y - \lambda\otimes\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where we adopt the usual convention that a combinatorial numbers are zero if its numerator is lesser than its denominator. Clearly the following facts hold:

(1) $q_{i0} = q_{i1} = 0$ for all $i \geq 0$ if and only if λ and ξ satisfy:

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} \lambda^m \xi^n q'_{mn} - \lambda\xi = 0, \tag{3.1 a}$$

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} m\lambda^{m-1}\xi^n q'_{mn} - \xi = 0, \tag{3.1 b}$$

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} \binom{m}{i}\lambda^{m-i}\xi^n q'_{mn} = 0 \qquad \text{for each } i > 1, \tag{3.1 c}$$

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} n\lambda^m\xi^{n-1} q'_{mn} - \lambda = 0, \tag{3.1 d}$$

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} \binom{m}{i} n\lambda^{m-i}\xi^{n-1} q'_{mn} \qquad \text{for each } i > 0. \tag{3.1 e}$$

(2) $q_{0j} = q_{1j} = 0$ for all $j \geq 0$ if and only if λ and ξ satisfy:

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} \lambda^m \xi^n q'_{mn} - \lambda\xi = 0, \tag{3.2 a}$$

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} n\lambda^m \xi^{n-1} q'_{mn} - \lambda = 0, \tag{3.2 b}$$

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{j} \lambda^m \xi^{n-j} q'_{mn} \qquad \text{for each } j > 1, \tag{3.2 c}$$

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} m\lambda^{m-1} \xi^n q'_{mn} - \xi = 0, \tag{3.2 d}$$

$$\sum_{mn=0}^{\infty} m\binom{n}{j} \lambda^{m-1} \xi^{n-j} q'_{mn} \qquad \text{for each } j > 0. \tag{3.2 e}$$

It is easy to check that conditions (3.1 a)–(3.1 e) are equivalents to

$$P_i(\xi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi^n q'_{in} = 0 \qquad \text{for } i \neq 1, \tag{3.3 a}$$

$$P_1(\xi) - \xi = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi^n q'_{1n} - \xi = 0, \tag{3.3 b}$$

$$P'_0(\xi) - \lambda = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n\xi^{n-1} q'_{0n} - \lambda = 0, \tag{3.3 c}$$

$$P'_i(\xi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n\xi^{n-1} q'_{in} \qquad \text{for } i > 0, \tag{3.3 d}$$

and that conditions (3.2 a)–(3.2 e) are equivalents to

$$Q_j(\lambda) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \lambda^m q'_{mj} = 0 \qquad \text{for } j \neq 1, \tag{3.4 a}$$

$$Q_1(\lambda) - \lambda = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \lambda^m q'_{m1} - \lambda = 0, \tag{3.4 b}$$

$$Q'_0(\lambda) - \xi = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m\lambda^{m-1} q'_{m0} - \xi = 0, \tag{3.4 c}$$

$$Q'_j(\lambda) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m\lambda^{m-1} q'_{mj} \qquad \text{for } j > 0. \tag{3.4 d}$$

So, equalities (3.3 a)–(3.3 d) correspond to the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4 (1) and to the thesis of Theorem 3.4 (2) and equalities (3.4 a)–(3.4 d) correspond to the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4 (2) and to the thesis of Theorem 3.4 (1). The proof can be easily finished using Theorem 3.4 and these remarks. □

Corollary 3.6. *Let* $\sum_{ij} q'_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j \in k[X] \otimes k[Y]$. *The following facts hold:*

(1) *If* $q'_{i0} = 0$ *for all* i *and* $q'_{i1} = 0$ *for all* $i \geq 1$, *then there exists an upper bounded twisting map* $s' \colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y]$ *such that*

$$s'(Y \otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q'_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j,$$

if and only if q'_{01} *is a multiple root of* $Q_j(Z) = \sum_{m\geq 0} q'_{mj} Z^m$ *for each* $j > 1$.

(2) *If* $q'_{0j} = 0$ *for all* j *and* $q'_{1j} = 0$ *for all* $j \geq 1$, *then there exists an lower bounded twisting map* $s' \colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y]$ *such that*

$$s'(Y \otimes X) = \sum_{ij} q'_{ij} X^i \otimes Y^j,$$

if and only if q'_{10} *is a multiple root of* $P_i(Z) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q'_{in} Z^n$ *for each* $i > 1$.

Proof. Item (2) follows immediately from item (1), since s' is a twisting map if and only if $\tau\circ s'\circ\tau$ is, where τ is the flip. So, we are reduced to prove the first item. This follows from Corollary 3.5, since $(q'_{01}, 0)$ satisfies the conditions asked for (λ, ξ) in item (1)(a) of that corollary and $(q'_{01}, 0)$ satisfies those required to (λ, ξ) in item (1)(b) if and only if q'_{01} is a multiple root of $Q_j(Z) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} q'_{mj} Z^m$ for each $j > 1$. □

The Corollary gains in interest if we realize that in item (1) we get all the upper bounded twisting maps with $\alpha_0 = 0$ and α_1 the evaluation at an element of k.

4. Non-commutative extensions of the dual numbers

It seems very difficult to compute all the twisting maps $s \colon k[Y] \otimes A \to A \otimes k[Y]$ for a particular algebra A. In this section we accomplish this for $A = k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle$ using the evident fact that s is a twisting map if and only if $\tau\circ s\circ\tau$ is also, where τ denotes the flip.

Theorem 4.1. *Let* A *be an algebra and* $s \colon k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle \otimes A \to A \otimes k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle$ *a twisting map. The maps* $\iota_0 \colon A \to A$ *and* $\iota_1 \colon A \to A$, *defined by*

$$s(t \otimes a) = \iota_0(a) \otimes 1 + \iota_1(a) \otimes t, \tag{4.1}$$

satisfy:

1. ι_1 *is a morphism of algebras.*
2. $\iota_0(ab) = \iota_0(a)b + \iota_1(a)\iota_0(b)$ *(that is,* ι_0 *is an* ι_1*-derivation).*
3. $\iota_0^2 = 0$ *and* $\iota_0\circ\iota_1 = -\iota_1\circ\iota_0$.

Conversely, given maps $\iota_0 \colon A \to A$ *and* $\iota_1 \colon A \to A$ *satisfying (1)–(3), the formula* (4.1) *determines a twisting map.*

Proof. Left to the reader. □

Lemma 4.2. *We define*

$$A_n^N = \sum_{k=0}^{N-n} (-1)^k \binom{n+k}{n}$$

Then the following facts hold:

$$2A_n^N - A_{n-1}^{N-1} = (-1)^{N-n} \binom{N}{n}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$2A_n^N - A_{n-1}^{N} = (-1)^{N-n} \binom{N+1}{n}, \tag{4.3}$$

$$2A_0^N = (-1)^N + 1, \qquad A_N^N = 1. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Assume $N-n=2j$ is even. Since $\binom{n+k}{n}-\binom{n+k+1}{n}=-\binom{n+k}{n-1}$,

$$A_n^N=-\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\binom{n+2k}{n-1}+\binom{N}{n}\quad\text{and}\quad A_n^N=\sum_{k=0}^{j}\binom{n+2k-1}{n-1}.$$

Summing both results, we obtain

$$2A_n^N=\sum_{k=0}^{N-n}(-1)^k\binom{n-1+k}{n-1}+(-1)^{N-n}\binom{N}{n},$$

and so

$$2A_n^N=A_{n-1}^{N-1}+(-1)^{N-n}\binom{N}{n},$$

which is (4.2). The case $N-n$ odd is similar. The equality (4.3) follows from (4.2). Finally, (4.4) can be easily checked by a direct computation. □

Lemma 4.3. *A vector $y=(y_i)\in k^m$ satisfies the set of equalities*

$$\sum_{i=h}^{m-1}y_{i+1}A_{i-h}^i=0\qquad \textit{for all } h=0,\dots,m-1,$$

where $A_n^N=\sum_{k=0}^{N-n}(-1)^k\binom{n+k}{n}$, if and only if it satisfies the set of equalities:

$$\sum_{i=h}^{m}\binom{i}{h}y_i=(-1)^h y_h\qquad \textit{for all } h=0,\dots,m.$$

Proof. Set

$$A(h)=\sum_{i=h}^{m-1}y_{i+1}A_{i-h}^i\quad\text{and}\quad B(h)=\sum_{i=h}^{m}\binom{i}{h}y_i-(-1)^h y_h.$$

We claim that

$$2A(h)-A(h+1)=(-1)^hB(h+1)\qquad \textit{for all } h=0,\dots,m-1.$$

From this equality and from $A(0)=B(0)$ it follows by induction on h that

$$A(h)=\sum_{k=0}^{h}(-1)^k2^{h-k}B(k),$$

and hence the lemma. Now we prove the claim:

$$\begin{aligned}
2A(h)-A(h+1)&=\sum_{i=h}^{m-1}2A_{i-h}^iy_{i+1}-\sum_{i=h+1}^{m-1}A_{i-h-1}^iy_{i+1}\\
&=\sum_{i=h+1}^{m-1}(2A_{i-h}^i-A_{i-h-1}^i)y_{i+1}+y_{h+1}2A_0^h\\
&=\sum_{i=h+1}^{m-1}(-1)^h\binom{i+1}{i-h}y_{i+1}+y_{h+1}((-1)^h+1)\\
&=\sum_{i=h+1}^{m}(-1)^h\binom{i}{h+1}y_i+y_{h+1}\\
&=(-1)^hB(h+1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from equalities (4.3) and (4.4). □

Theorem 4.4. *Let* $s\colon k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle \otimes k[Y] \to k[Y]\otimes k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle$ *be a twisting map and let* $\iota_j\colon k[Y]\to k[Y]$ $(j=0,1)$ *be the maps introduced in Theorem 4.1. Write* $\iota_0(Y)=Q$ *and* $\iota_1(Y)=P$. *If* $Q=\sum_{i=0}^m q_iY^i\neq 0$, *then* $P=-Y+p_0$ *and*

(1) *If* $p_0=0$, *then* $q_i=0$ *for* i *odd,*

(2) *If* $p_0\neq 0$, *then* $\displaystyle\sum_{j=i}^{m}\binom{j}{i}q_jp_0^{j-i}=(-1)^iq_i$ *for all* $i=0,\dots,m$.

(Note that item (2) implies that m *is even). Conversely, if* $Q=0$ *and* P *is arbitrary or* $P=-Y+p_0$ *and conditions (1), (2) are satisfied, then there is a unique twisting map* $s\colon k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle\otimes k[Y]\to k[Y]\otimes k[t]/\langle t^2\rangle$ *such that* $\iota_0(Y)=Q$ *and* $\iota_1(Y)=P$, *where the maps* ι_0 *and* ι_1 *are defined as in Theorem 4.1.*

Proof. Let s be a twisting map. Assume $Q\neq 0$. In the sequel we adopt the convention that $P^0=1$ even if $P=0$. It is easy to check by induction on l, that

$$\iota_0(Y^l)=\sum_{i=0}^{l-1}\iota_1(Y)^i\iota_0(Y)Y^{l-i-1}=Q\sum_{i=0}^{l-1}P^iY^{l-i-1}. \tag{4.5}$$

We claim that $\mathsf{dg}(P)=1$. Suppose $\mathsf{dg}(P)\neq 1$ or $P=0$. Let $l\geq 1$. If $\mathsf{dg}(P)>1$, then $\iota_0(Y^l)$ has degree $(l-1)\,\mathsf{dg}(P)+\mathsf{dg}(Q)$, and if P is a constant, then it has degree $l-1+\mathsf{dg}(Q)$. In both cases it is easy to see that $\iota_0^2=0\Leftrightarrow\mathsf{dg}(Q)=0$. Let $Q=q\in k\setminus\{0\}$. It is immediate that if $\mathsf{dg}(P)>1$, then $\iota_0(\iota_1(Y))=\iota_0(P)$ has degree $(\mathsf{dg}(P)-1)\,\mathsf{dg}(P)$. Since $\iota_1(\iota_0(Y))=q$, it is impossible that $\iota_0\circ\iota_1=-\iota_1\circ\iota_0$. So $P=0$ or $\mathsf{dg}(P)\leq 1$. If P is a constant, then $\iota_0(\iota_1(Y))=0$ and also in this case $\iota_0\circ\iota_1\neq-\iota_1\circ\iota_0$. This proves the claim. Write $P=p_1Y+p_0$. We assert that the following facts hold

(3) $\displaystyle\iota_0^2(Y)=Q\sum_{h=0}^{m-1}\sum_{i=h}^{m-1}\sum_{j=i-h}^{i}\binom{j}{i-h}p_1^{j-i+h}p_0^{i-h}q_{i+1}Y^h.$

(4) $\displaystyle\iota_1(\iota_0(Y))=\sum_{i=0}^{m}\sum_{j=i}^{m}\binom{j}{i}q_jp_0^{j-i}p_1^iY^i$ and $\displaystyle\iota_0(\iota_1(Y))=p_1\sum_{i=0}^{m}q_iY^i.$

In fact by (4.5), we have

$$\iota_0^2(Y)=\sum_{i=0}^{m}q_i\iota_0(Y^i)=Q\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}q_iP^jY^{i-j-1}.$$

Since $P^j=\sum_{l=0}^{j}\binom{j}{l}p_1^{j-l}p_0^lY^{j-l}$, this gives

$$\iota_0^2(Y)=Q\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\sum_{l=0}^{j}q_i\binom{j}{l}p_1^{j-l}p_0^lY^{i-l-1}.$$

A change of indices yields item (3). Next we check item (4). We have

$$\iota_1(\iota_0(Y))=\sum_{j=0}^{m}q_j\iota_1(Y)^j=\sum_{j=0}^{m}\sum_{l=0}^{j}q_j\binom{j}{l}p_1^{j-l}p_0^lY^{j-l}=\sum_{j=0}^{m}\sum_{i=0}^{j}q_j\binom{j}{i}p_1^ip_0^{j-i}Y^i.$$

Interchanging the sums we obtain item (4), since the second equality is clear. Considering now the terms of maximal degree in items (3) and (4), we get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{m-1}p_1^j=0\qquad\text{and}\qquad p_1^m=-p_1,$$

since, by Theorem 4.1 we know that

$$\iota_0^2(Y)=0\qquad\text{and}\qquad\iota_1(\iota_0(Y))=-\iota_0(\iota_1(Y)). \tag{4.6}$$

Hence $p_1 = -1$ and equalities (3) and (4) become

$$(5)\ \iota_0^2(Y) = Q \sum_{h=0}^{m-1} \sum_{i=h}^{m-1} \sum_{j=i-h}^{i} \binom{j}{i-h} (-1)^{j-i+h} p_0^{i-h} q_{i+1} Y^h.$$

$$(6)\ \iota_1(\iota_0(Y)) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=i}^{m} \binom{j}{i} q_j p_0^{j-i} (-1)^i Y^i \text{ and } \iota_0(\iota_1(Y)) = -\sum_{i=0}^{m} q_i Y^i.$$

From this it follows immediately that equalities (4.6) implies items (1) and (2). Now we prove the second part. First note that for $P, Q \in k[Y]$ arbitrary, equalities $\iota_0(Y) = Q$ and $\iota_1(Y) = P$ determine unique maps $\iota_0, \iota_1 \colon k[Y] \to k[Y]$ satisfying conditions (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.1. Clearly condition (3) is also fulfilled if and only if $\iota_0^2(Y) = 0$ and $\iota_1(\iota_0(Y)) = -\iota_0(\iota_1(Y))$. When $Q = 0$ these last equalities are trivially true. Assume now $Q \neq 0$ and $P = -Y + p_0$. Then, arguing as above, we obtain that (5) and (6) are satisfied. From this it follows immediately that, if $p_0 = 0$ and $q_i = 0$ for i odd, then equalities (4.6) are true. Assume now that $p_0 \neq 0$. In this case from (5) and (6) it follows that $\iota_0^2(Y) = 0$ is equivalent to the fact that the q_i's satisfy

$$\sum_{i=h}^{m-1} q_{i+1} p_0^{i+1} A_{i-h}^{i} = 0 \qquad \text{for all } h = 0, \dots, m-1,$$

where $A_n^N := \sum_{k=0}^{N-n} (-1)^k \binom{n+k}{n}$ and that $\iota_1(\iota_0(Y)) = -\iota_0(\iota_1(Y))$ is equivalent to the fact that the q_i's satisfy

$$\sum_{j=i}^{m} \binom{j}{i} q_j p_0^{j-i} = (-1)^i q_i \qquad \text{for all } i = 0, \dots, m,$$

which is true by item (2). But, by Lemma 4.3, applied to $\{y_i = q_i p_0^i\}$, the last set of equalities implies the first one. So the theorem is proved. □

In the previous theorem we found necessary and sufficient conditions, on polynomials $P, Q \in k[Y]$, in order that a twisting map

$$s \colon k[t]/\langle t^2 \rangle \otimes k[Y] \to k[Y] \otimes k[t]/\langle t^2 \rangle$$

such that $s(t \otimes Y) = P \otimes t + Q \otimes 1$ exists. If $Q = 0$, then P is arbitrary and if $Q \neq 0$ then $P = -Y + p_0$ and items (1) or (2) of Theorem 4.4 must be satisfied, depending on if $p_0 = 0$ or $p_0 \neq 0$. In the first case the condition is simply that $Q \in k[Y^2]$. The second case is more involved and we give a complete solution under the hypothesis that k is a characteristic zero field.

Corollary 4.5. *(Classification of the non-commutative extension of the algebra of dual numbers by $k[Y]$). Let k be a characteristic zero field. If $Q \neq 0$, then any choice of $p_0 \in k \setminus \{0\}$, m even and $q_0, q_2, \dots, q_m \in k$, with $q_m \neq 0$ determines univocally polynomials $P = -Y + p_0$ and $Q = \sum_{i=0}^{m} q_i Y^i$ satisfying condition (2) of Theorem 4.4.*

Proof. For each $i \geq 0$, let $y_i = q_i p_0^i$. Consider $\mathbf{y} = (y_0, \dots, y_m)$ as a column vector. By item (3) of Theorem 4.4, there is a twisting map

$$s \colon k[t]/\langle t^2 \rangle \otimes k[Y] \to k[Y] \otimes k[t]/\langle t^2 \rangle$$

such that $s(t \otimes Y) = P \otimes t + Q \otimes 1$, if and only if $\sum_{j=i}^{m} \binom{j}{i} y_j - (-1)^i y_i = 0$ for $i = 0, \dots, m$. Write the system of equations

$$B(i) = \sum_{j=i}^{m} \binom{j}{i} y_j - (-1)^i y_i = 0 \qquad (j = 0, \dots, m)$$

in the matrix form $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$. It is then easy to see that $\mathbf{C} = (c_{ij})_{0 \le i,j \le m}$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots\dots\dots & & 1 \\
0 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & \dots\dots\dots & & \binom{m}{1} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 6 & 10 & 15 & \dots\dots\dots & & \binom{m}{2} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 10 & 20 & \dots\dots\dots & & \binom{m}{3} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 15 & \dots\dots\dots & & \binom{m}{4} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 6 & \dots\dots\dots & & \binom{m}{5} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \binom{m-1}{1} & \binom{m}{2} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 2 & \binom{m}{1}
\end{pmatrix}$$

By the shape of this matrix it is clear that the even rows are linearly independent and so we only need to prove that $\mathsf{rank}(\mathbf{C}) = m/2$. For this it suffices to check that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k c_{i,2n-k} \binom{n}{k} = 0 \qquad \text{for } n \ge 1 \text{ and } i = 0, \dots, m, \tag{4.7}$$

since then the even columns will be linear combinations of the previous ones. Let

$$D_{ij}^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \binom{j-n}{i-n} & \text{if } n \le i \le j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \qquad E_{ij}^{(n)} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{j+1}\binom{n}{j-i} & \text{if } j-n \le i \le j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $E_{i,2n}^{(n)} + D_{i,2n}^{(n)} = 0$ in order to prove (4.7) it is enough to show that

$$E_{ij}^{(n)} + D_{ij}^{(n)} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (-1)^k c_{i,j-k} \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, m \text{ and } j \ge n.$$

This follows immediately from the equalities

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{ij}^{(0)} + D_{ij}^{(0)} &= c_{ij}, \\
D_{ij}^{(n)} &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k D_{i,j-k}^{(0)} \binom{n}{k}, \\
E_{hj}^{(n)} &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k E_{i,j-k}^{(0)} \binom{n}{k},
\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 0, \dots, m$ and $j \ge n$. The first and the third one can be checked by a direct computation, while the second one by induction on n. □

Let s, P and Q be as in Theorem 4.4. Let $\alpha_j \colon k[t]/\langle t^2 \rangle \to k[t]/\langle t^2 \rangle$ be the maps defined by

$$\tau \circ s \circ \tau(Y \otimes t) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j(t) \otimes Y^j,$$

where τ is the flip. If $Q = 0$ and $P = \sum_{i=0}^{n} p_i Y^i$, then $\alpha_j(t) = p_j t$. If P and Q are as in items (1) and (2) of Theorems 4.4, then

$$\alpha_j(t) = \begin{cases} q_0 + p_0 t & \text{if } j = 0, \\ q_1 - p_1 t & \text{if } j = 1, \\ q_j & \text{if } 2 \le j \le m, \\ 0 & \text{if } j > m. \end{cases}$$

5. Twisted extensions by power series

Let k be a commutative ring. This section is devoted to the study of twisting tensor products between the power series ring $k[[Y]]$ and a filtrated complete algebra A. Hence we work in the monoidal category CMod of complete filtrated k-modules (see Section 1). Recall that the tensor product of CMod is denoted by $\hat{\otimes}$. We will use freely the notations introduced in Sections 1 and 2.

Lemma 5.1. *Let A be a filtrated complete algebra and $(\alpha_j\colon A\to A)_{j\ge 0}$ a family of continuous maps. If for each $i\ge 0$ there exists $n_0\ge 0$ such that $\alpha_0^n(A)\subseteq A_i$ for all $n\ge n_0$, then for each $i,j\ge 0$ there exists $r_0\ge 0$ such that $\gamma_j^{(r)}(A_h)\subseteq A_i$ whenever $r+h\ge r_0$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on j. First we assume $j=0$. By hypothesis there exists $n_0\ge 0$, such that $\gamma_0^{(n)}(A)=\alpha_0^n(A)\subseteq A_i$ whenever $n\ge n_0$. Since α_0 is continuous, there exists $h_0\ge 0$ such that $\gamma_0^{(n)}(A_h)=\alpha_0^n(A_h)\subseteq A_i$, for each $n<n_0$ and $h>h_0$. Clearly we can take $r_0=n_0+h_0$. Assume the lemma is valid for j and write

$$\gamma_{j+1}^{(r)}=\sum_{l_1=0}^{r-1}\sum_{l_2=1}^{j+1}\alpha_0^{l_1}\circ\alpha_{l_2}\circ\gamma_{j+1-l_2}^{(r-l_1-1)}.$$

Since $\alpha_0^n(A)\subseteq A_i$ for all $n\ge n_0$ in order to complete the inductive step it suffices to show that for all $l_1<n_0$ and $l_2\le j+1$, there exists $r_0\ge 0$ such that

$$\alpha_0^{l_1}\circ\alpha_{l_2}\circ\gamma_{j+1-l_2}^{(r-l_1-1)}(A_h)\subseteq A_i\quad\text{whenever } r+h\ge r_0,$$

which follows immediately from the continuity of $\alpha_0^{l_1}\circ\alpha_{l_2}$ and the inductive hypothesis. □

Remark 5.2. If $s\colon k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}A\to A\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$ is a twisting map, then $\ker(\alpha_0)$ is a closed subalgebra of A. Moreover,

- If $\alpha_0=0$, then α_1 is a endomorphism of algebras.
- Let $\nu>1$. If $\alpha_j=0$ for $1<j<\nu$, then

$$\alpha_\nu(ab)=\alpha_1(a)\alpha_\nu(b)+\alpha_\nu(a)\alpha_1^\nu(b).$$

Theorem 5.3. *Let A be a filtrated complete algebra and $s\colon k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}A\to A\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$ a twisting map. The equation*

$$s(Y\hat{\otimes}a)=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\alpha_j(a)\hat{\otimes}Y^j,$$

defines a family of maps $\alpha_j\colon A\to A$, which satisfies:

1. *The α_j's are continuous maps.*
2. *For each $i\ge 0$ there exists n_0 such that $\alpha_0^n(A)\subseteq A_i$ for all $n\ge n_0$.*
3. *$\alpha_j(1)=\delta_{j1}$, where δ_{j1} denotes the symbol of Kronecker.*
4. *For all $j\ge 0$ and all $a,b\in A$,*

$$\alpha_j(ab)=\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}\alpha_r(a)\gamma_j^{(r)}(b)\quad\textit{(this formula makes sense by Lemma 5.1).}$$

Moreover,

$$s\left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}Y^r\hat{\otimes}a_r\right)=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}\gamma_j^{(r)}(a_r)\right)\hat{\otimes}Y^j. \tag{5.1}$$

Conversely, given maps $\alpha_j\colon A\to A$ ($j\ge 0$) satisfying (1)–(4), the formula (5.1) *defines a twisting map.*

Proof. Items (1) and (2) follows easily from the continuity of s, and items (3) and (4) can be checked as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. To check (5.1) we can assume that only one $a_r \neq 0$. In this case we can proceed again as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Conversely, assume we have a family of continuous maps $(\alpha_j)_{j\geq 0}$ satisfying (1), (2), (3) and (4) and define s by the formula (5.1). By Lemma 5.1 this map is well defined and it is continuous. We leave the task to prove that s is a twisting map to the reader. ☐

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\alpha\colon A \to A$ be an automorphism of filtrated completed algebras. For each $i \geq 1$, let $\beta_i\colon A \to A$ be a continuous (α, α^{i+1})-derivation. If*

$$\alpha^r(\beta_i(a))\beta_{i'}(b) = 0 \quad \text{for all } r \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } a, b \in A \text{ whenever } i + i' \geq 3,$$

then, the formula

$$s(Y \otimes a) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha_j(a) \otimes Y^j,$$

where the maps $\alpha_j\colon A \to A$ $(j \geq 0)$ are constructed as in Lemma 2.5, defines a twisting map $s\colon k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}A \to A\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$.

Proof. Mimic the proof of Theorem 2.7. ☐

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\sum_{ij} a_{ij}X^i\hat{\otimes}Y^j \in k[[X]]\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$. Assume that $a_{i0} = 0$ for all i. The equality*

$$\alpha_1(X) = \sum_{i\geq 0} a_{i1}X^i$$

defines a continuous algebra map $\alpha_1\colon k[[X]] \to k[[X]]$ if and only if the independent term a_{01} of $\alpha_1(X)$ is nilpotent. Moreover, in this case, there is a unique family continous maps $\bigl(\alpha_j\colon k[[X]] \to k[[X]]\bigr)_{j\geq 2}$, that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{j+1}(1) &= \delta_{j+1,1},\\
\alpha_{j+1}(X) &= \sum_{i\geq 0} a_{i,j+1}X^i,\\
\alpha_{j+1}(X^{n+1}) &= \sum_{r=1}^{j+1} \alpha_r(X^n)\gamma_{j+1}^{(r)}(X),
\end{aligned}$$

for all $j \geq 1$.

Proof. The first assertion it is immediate. In order to prove the second one it will be sufficient to show that

$$\alpha_j(X^n) \in \sum_{r=0}^{n-j+1} a_{01}^{n-j-r+1}X^r k[[X]] \qquad \text{if } n \geq j.$$

We will prove this fact by induction on j. For $j = 1$ this is clear. Assume it is true for j and for $\alpha_{j+1}(X^h)$ with $j \leq h \leq n$. Then, by the inductive hypothesis and the facts that,

$$\alpha_{j+1}(X^{n+1}) = \sum_{s=1}^{j+1} \alpha_s(X^n)\gamma_{j+1}^{(s)}(X)$$

and

$$\gamma_{j+1}^{(j+1)}(X) = \alpha_1^{j+1}(X) \in a_{01}k[[X]] + Xk[[X]],$$

we get that for all $n \geq j$,

$$\alpha_{j+1}(X^{n+1}) \in \sum_{s=1}^{j} \sum_{r=0}^{n-s+1} a_{01}^{n-s-r+1} X^r k[[X]] + a_{01}^{n-j-r} X^r k[[X]](a_{01}k[[X]] + Xk[[X]]).$$

Using this the proof can be easily finished. $\square$

Theorem 5.6. *Let* $\sum_{ij} a_{ij} X^i \hat{\otimes} Y^j \in k[[X]]\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$. *If* $a_{i0} = 0$ *for all* i *and* a_{01} *is nilpotent, then there is a unique twisting map* $s\colon k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}k[[X]] \to k[[X]]\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$ *satisfying*

$$s(Y\hat{\otimes}X) = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} X^i \hat{\otimes} Y^j$$

Moreover

$$s(Y\hat{\otimes}P) = \sum_{j\geq 1} \alpha_j(P)\hat{\otimes}Y^j,$$

where $\alpha_j\colon k[[X]] \to k[[X]]$ $(j \geq 1)$ *are the maps introduced in Lemma 5.5.*

Proof. The uniqueness and the last assertion are immediate. Let us prove the existence. Let $\alpha_0 = 0$. By Lemma 5.5 we know that the maps α_j are well defined and continuous. Moreover, it is evident that items (1), (2) and (3) of Theorem 5.3 are satisfied. So we only must prove item (4), which (by linearity and continuity) reduce to check that

$$\alpha_j(X^m X^n) = \sum_{l=1}^{j} \alpha_l(X^m)\gamma_j^{(l)}(X^n) \quad \text{for all } m, n \geq 0.$$

For $j = 1$ this follows from Remark 5.2. Assume that the result is true for α_q with $q < j$ and for $\alpha_j(X^m X^b)$ with $b \leq n$. By the recursive definition of α_j and the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_j(X^m X^{n+1}) &= \sum_{r=1}^{j} \alpha_r(X^m X^n)\gamma_j^{(r)}(X)\\
&= \sum_{r=1}^{j}\sum_{l=1}^{r} \alpha_l(X^m)\gamma_r^{(l)}(X^n)\gamma_j^{(r)}(X)\\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{j}\sum_{r=l}^{j} \alpha_l(X^m)\gamma_r^{(l)}(X^n)\gamma_j^{(r)}(X).
\end{aligned}$$

So it is enough to show that

$$\gamma_j^{(l)}(X^{n+1}) = \sum_{r=l}^{j} \gamma_r^{(l)}(X^n)\gamma_j^{(r)}(X) \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, j.$$

We prove this formula by induction on l. When $l = 1$ this is true by the recursive definition of $\alpha_j(X^{n+1}) = \gamma_j^{(1)}(X^{n+1})$. Suppose $l > 1$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_j^{(l)}(X^{n+1}) &= \sum_{q_1=1}^{j-l+1} \sum_{|q_2,\dots,q_l| = j-q_1} \alpha_{q_1}\bigl(\alpha_{q_2\dots q_l}(X^{n+1})\bigr)\\
&= \sum_{q=1}^{j-l+1} \alpha_q\bigl(\gamma_{j-q}^{(l-1)}(X^{n+1})\bigr)\\
&= \sum_{q=1}^{j-l+1}\sum_{s=l-1}^{j-q} \alpha_q\bigl(\gamma_s^{(l-1)}(X^n)\gamma_{j-q}^{(s)}(X)\bigr)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{s=l-1}^{j-1} \sum_{q=1}^{j-s} \sum_{h=1}^{q} \alpha_h\bigl(\gamma_s^{(l-1)}(X^n)\bigr)\gamma_q^{(h)}\bigl(\gamma_{j-q}^{(s)}(X)\bigr)\\
&= \sum_{s=l-1}^{j-1} \sum_{h=1}^{j-s} \sum_{q=h}^{j-s} \alpha_h\bigl(\gamma_s^{(l-1)}(X^n)\bigr)\gamma_q^{(h)}\bigl(\gamma_{j-q}^{(s)}(X)\bigr)\\
&= \sum_{r=l}^{j} \gamma_r^{(l)}(X^n)\gamma_j^{(r)}(X),
\end{aligned}
$$

as desired. □

Remark 5.7. Let $\sum_{ij} a_{ij} X^i \hat{\otimes} Y^j \in k[[X]]\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$. Suppose that $a_{0j} = 0$ for all j and a_{10} is nilpotent. By Theorem 5.6 we know that there exists a unique twisting map $s\colon k[[X]]\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]] \to k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}k[[X]]$ satisfying

$$s(X\hat{\otimes}Y) = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} Y^j \hat{\otimes} X^i.$$

But then the map $\tau\circ s\circ\tau$, where $\tau\colon k[[Y]]\hat{\otimes}k[[X]] \to k[[X]]\hat{\otimes}k[[Y]]$ is the flip, is a twisting map taking $Y \otimes X$ to $\sum_{ij} a_{ij} X^i \hat{\otimes} Y^j$.

Appendix A.

This appendix is devoted to prove Theorem 3.4. So, we assume that k is a commutative domain. Since $s\colon k[Y] \otimes k[X] \to k[X] \otimes k[Y]$ is a twisting map there is a family of maps $(\alpha_n\colon k[X] \to k[X])_{n\ge 0}$ satisfying the conditions established in Theorem 2.1. An easy argument (see the proof of Theorem 3.4 at the end of this appendix) shows that, under the hypothesis of item (1) of Theorem 3.4, $\alpha_0 = 0$, $\alpha_1 = ev_0$ and there exists $\nu \ge 2$ such that $\alpha_\nu \ne 0$ and $\alpha_k = 0$ for $1 < k < \nu$. We do not will use these facts until Lemma A.5.

Lemma A.1. *Let $j_0, r_0 \ge 0$. If $\alpha_l(X^{j_0}) = 0$ for all $l \le r_0$, then $\alpha_l(X^j) = 0$ for all $l \le r_0$ and $j \ge j_0$.*

Proof. By item (3) of Theorem 2.1,

$$\alpha_l(X^j) = \sum_{h=0}^{l} \alpha_h(X^{j_0})\gamma_l^{(h)}(X^{j-j_0}) = 0,$$

for all $l \le r_0$ and $j > j_0$, as desired. □

Lemma A.2. *Let $j_0, \rho_0 \ge 0$ and $a \ge 1$ be integers. If*

1. *$\alpha_l(X^{j_0}) = 0$ for all $l \le \rho_0$,*
2. *$\gamma_s^{(l)}(X) = 0$ for all $l > \rho_0$ and $s < l + a$,*

then $\alpha_l(X^{j+i}) = 0$ for all $i \ge 0$, $l \le \rho_0 + ia$ and $j \ge j_0$.

Proof. Note that the case $i = 0$ follows immediately from Lemma A.1. We now prove the assertion for $i = 1$. Take $j \ge j_0$ and $l \le \rho_0 + a$. By item (2) we have $\gamma_l^{(h)}(X) = 0$ for all $h > \rho_0$, since $l < \rho_0 + h$. So,

$$\alpha_l(X^{j+1}) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \alpha_h(X^j)\gamma_l^{(h)}(X) = \sum_{h=0}^{\rho_0} \alpha_h(X^j)\gamma_l^{(h)}(X) = 0,$$

where the last equality follows from the case $i = 0$. An easy induction argument on i concludes the proof. □

Lemma A.3. *Let $j_0, \rho_0 \ge 0$ and $a \ge 1$ be integers. Assume that*

1. *$\alpha_{\rho_0+1}(X^{j_0}) \neq 0$,*
2. *$\alpha_l(X^{j_0}) = 0$ for all $l \le \rho_0$,*
3. *$\gamma_s^{(l)} = \delta_{ls} ev_0$ for all $l > \rho_0$ and $s < l + a$,*
4. *$\gamma_{l+a}^{(l)} = \alpha_1 \circ \alpha_{a+1}$ for all $l > \rho_0$.*

Then

$$\alpha_{\rho_0+ia+1}(X^{j_0+iu}) = \alpha_{\rho_0+1}(X^{j_0})\alpha_{1,a+1}(X^u)^i \qquad \text{for all } u \ge 1 \text{ and } i \ge 0.$$

Moreover, if for each $u \ge 1$ there is an $i \ge 0$ such that $\alpha_{\rho_0+ia+1}(X^{j_0+iu}) = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{1,a+1} = 0, \\ &\alpha_{\rho_0+ia+1}(X^{j_0+iu}) = 0 \qquad && \text{for all } u \ge 1 \text{ and } i \ge 1, \\ &\gamma_s^{(l)} = \delta_{ls} ev_0 && \text{for all } l > \rho_0 \text{ and } s \le l + a. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $i = 0$ the first assertion is trivial. Suppose it is true for i. By Lemma A.2,

$$\alpha_l(X^{j_0+iu}) = 0 \quad \text{for } l \le \rho_0 + ia,$$

since $j_0 + (u-1)i \ge j_0$. Write $p = \rho_0 + ia + 1$. By item (3), we know that $\gamma_{p+a}^{(l)}(X^u) = 0$ for all $l > p$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{p+a}(X^{j_0+(i+1)u}) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \alpha_l(X^{j_0+iu})\gamma_{p+a}^{(l)}(X^u) \\ &= \alpha_p(X^{j_0+iu})\gamma_{p+a}^{(p)}(X^u) \\ &= \alpha_{\rho_0+1}(X^{j_0})\alpha_{1,a+1}(X^u)^i\alpha_{1,a+1}(X^u) \\ &= \alpha_{\rho_0+1}(X^{j_0})\alpha_{1,a+1}(X^u)^{i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from the inductive hypothesis and item (4). It is now clear that if for each $u \ge 1$ there is an i such that $\alpha_{\rho_0+ia+1}(X^{j_0+iu}) = 0$, then $\alpha_{1,a+1}(X^u) = 0$, for all $u \ge 1$. Combined this with item (2) of Theorem 2.1, we obtain $\alpha_{1,a+1} = 0$. The remainder assertions follows now easily. □

Lemma A.4. *Let $b, n_1, \dots, n_l \ge \nu \ge 2$ be integers such that:*

1. *$\sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i \le (l-1)b + \nu$,*
2. *If $i \ge 2$ and $n_i < b$, then $n_{i-1} \ge b(\nu - 1) + 2$,*
3. *If $\nu = 2$, then $n_{i-2} \ge 2b - 1$ for all $i \ge 3$ with $n_i < b$ and $n_{i-1} \le 2b - 2$.*

Then $n_1 = \nu$ and $n_i = b$ for $i = 2, \dots, l$.

Proof. If $n_i \ge b$ for all i, then by item (1),

$$(l-1)b + \nu \ge \sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i \ge bl.$$

Hence $b = n_1 = \cdots = n_l = \nu$. Thus we can assume that the set of the indices $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m$, such that $n_{i_j} < b$, is not empty. We claim that $m = 1$. In the hope of reaching a contradiction we assume $m \ge 2$. We consider first the case $\nu \ge 3$. This implies $2 + \nu + (\nu - 1)b > 2b$. Set $M := \{i_2, \dots, i_m\}$, write $M - 1 := \{i - 1 : i \in M\}$ and set $L := \{i_1\} \cup M \cup (M - 1)$. From item (2) it follows easily that $i_2 > 2$ and $\{i_1\}$, M and $(M-1)$ are pairwise disjoint sets, which implies $\#L = 2m-1$. Again by item (2), we have $n_{i-1} \geq b(\nu-1)+2$, for $i \in M$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in L} n_i &= n_{i_1} + \sum_{i\in M} n_i + \sum_{i\in M-1} n_i \\ &\geq \nu + (m-1)\nu + (m-1)(b(\nu-1)+2) \\ &> \nu + (m-1)2b,\end{aligned}$$

since $(\nu-1)b \geq 2b$ and $m-1>0$. Moreover, $n_i \geq b$ for $i \notin L$, and so,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i = \sum_{i\in L} n_i + \sum_{i\notin L} n_i > \nu + (m-1)2b + (l-(2m-1))b = \nu + b(l-1),$$

which contradicts item (1). It remains to consider the case $\nu = 2$. Set

$$I := \{i_j : j \geq 2 \text{ and } b+2 \leq n_{i_j-1} \leq 2b-2\}$$

and

$$J := \{i_j : j \geq 2 \text{ and } n_{i_j-1} \geq 2b-1\}.$$

By item (2), we have $\{i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m\} = \{i_1\} \cup I \cup J$ and $i_2 > 2$. Write

$$I-1 := \{i-1 : i \in I\}, \quad I-2 := \{i-2 : i \in I\} \quad \text{and} \quad J-1 := \{i-1 : i \in J\}$$

and set

$$\bar{I} := I \cup (I-1) \cup (I-2), \quad \bar{J} := J \cup (J-1) \quad \text{and} \quad K := \{i_1\} \cup \bar{I} \cup \bar{J}.$$

We assert that $\{i_1\}$, I, J, $I-1$, $J-1$ and $I-2$ are pairwise disjoint. It is immediate that for $\{i_1\}$, I and J this is true. By definition, if $i \in I-1$, then $n_i \geq b+2$. Therefore $i \notin \{i_1, \ldots, i_m\}$ and so $I-1$ is disjoint from $\{i_1\} \cup I \cup J$. Similarly $J-1$ is disjoint from $\{i_1\} \cup I \cup J$. Moreover $(I-1) \cap (J-1) = \emptyset$, since $I \cap J = \emptyset$ and similarly $(I-2) \cap (I-1) = \emptyset = (I-2) \cap (J-1)$. It remains to check that

$$\{i_1\} \cap (I-2) = I \cap (I-2) = J \cap (I-2) = \emptyset. \tag{A.1}$$

But by item (3),

$$i \in I-2 \Rightarrow i+2 \in I \Rightarrow n_{i+2} < b \text{ and } n_{i+1} \leq 2b-2 \Rightarrow n_i \geq 2b-1 \geq b,$$

from which (A.1) follows immediately. This finishes the proof of the assertion. It is immediate now that

$$k = 1 + 3k_1 + 2k_2,$$

where $k = \#K$, $k_1 = \#I$ and $k_2 = \#J$. Moreover,

$$n_i + n_{i-1} \geq 2 + 2b - 1 = 2b+1 \quad \text{for all } i \in J$$

and by condition (3),

$$n_i + n_{i-1} + n_{i-2} \geq 2 + b + 2 + 2b - 1 = 3b + 3 \quad \text{for all } i \in I.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{i\in K} n_i \geq 2 + (3b+3)k_1 + (2b+1)k_2 > (k-1)b + 2,$$

since $k_1 > 0$ or $k_2 > 0$ by assumption. Since $n_i \geq b$ for $i \notin K$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i = \sum_{i\in K} n_i + \sum_{i\notin K} n_i > (k-1)b + 2 + (l-k)b = (l-1)b + 2,$$

which contradicts item (1). Hence $m = 1$, but then

$$(l-1)b + \nu \geq \sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i \geq (l-1)b + \nu,$$

where the first inequality is item (1). So $n_{i_1} = \nu$ and $n_i = b$ for $i \neq i_1$. By item (2) this is only possible if $i_1 = 1$. ☐

In the sequel we assume that $\alpha_0 = 0$, $\alpha_1 = \mathsf{ev}_0$ and there exists $n > 1$ such that $\alpha_n \neq 0$. Let ν be the least number satisfying this property. By Remark 2.2 we know that $\alpha_\nu(X) \neq 0$. We define

$$r_j(b) = \frac{(\nu-1)(b^j-1)}{b-1} \quad \text{for } b \geq \nu \text{ and } j \geq 1.$$

Lemma A.5. *Let $k_1 > 0$ and $b \geq \nu$ be integers. Assume $\alpha_{1k} = 0$ for $k = 2, \dots, k_1$.*

1. *If $l > k_1$, then*
$$\gamma_{l+k_1}^{(l)} = \alpha_1^{l-1} \circ \alpha_{k_1+1}.$$
2. *If $\nu = 2$, $b \geq 4$ and $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq b+1$ and $j < b$, then*
$$\gamma_{l+k_1}^{(l)} = \alpha_1^{l-1} \circ \alpha_{k_1+1},$$
as long as $k_1 < 2b+8$ and $l \geq b+2$.
3. *Suppose $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq 1+(\nu-1)b$ and $j < b$. When $\nu = 2$ also suppose that $\alpha_{ijk} = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq 2b-2$, $j \leq 2b-2$ and $k < b$. Let $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ arbitrary and set $r_0 = r_{j_0}(b)$. We have*
$$\gamma_{r_0+1+(\nu-1)b^{j_0}}^{(r_0+1)} = \alpha_1^{r_0} \circ \alpha_{(\nu-1)b^{j_0}+1} + \alpha_\nu \circ \alpha_b^{r_0}$$
and
$$\gamma_{l+k_1}^{(l)} = \alpha_1^{l-1} \circ \alpha_{k_1+1},$$
as long as $k_1 \leq (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$ and $l > r_0$ with $(l, k_1) \neq (r_0+1, (\nu-1)b^{j_0})$.

Proof. By definition

$$\gamma_{l+k_1}^{(l)} = \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_l| = l+k_1} \alpha_{n_1\dots n_l}.$$

Suppose $\alpha_{n_1\dots n_l} \neq 0$. Since $\alpha_0 = 0$, this implies $n_1, \dots, n_l \geq 1$. Assume $n_i = 1$ for some i and let i_0 be the greatest index satisfying this property. Being $\alpha_{k1} = 0$ for all $k \neq 1$ it must be $n_i = 1$ for all $i \leq i_0$. Since $|n_1, \dots, n_l| = l + k_1 > l$ and $\alpha_{1k} = 0$ for $k = 2, \dots, k_1$ the only possible choice is $n_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, l-1$ and $n_l = k_1 + 1$. Hence,

$$\gamma_{l+k_1}^{(l)} = \alpha_1^{l-1} \circ \alpha_{k_1+1} + \sum_{\substack{|n_1,\dots,n_l| = l+k_1 \\ n_1,\dots,n_l \geq \nu}} \alpha_{n_1\dots n_l},$$

since $\alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_{\nu-1} = 0$. Item (1) follows now immediately, because

$$l > k_1 \Rightarrow 2l > l + k_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i \Rightarrow n_i < 2 \text{ for some } i.$$

In order to prove item (2) we proceed by contradiction. Suppose there is $\alpha_{n_1\dots n_l} \neq 0$ with $n_1, \dots, n_l \geq 2$. Let $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m$ be the indices such that $n_{i_j} < b$. Set $J = \{i_j : j \geq 2\}$ and $K = \{i_1\} \cup J \cup (J-1)$. By hypothesis $n_i \geq b+2$ for all $i \in J-1$. Consequently $\{i_1\}$, J and $J-1$ are pairwise disjoint. So $2m-1 \leq l$ and

$$\begin{aligned} l + k_1 &= n_{i_1} + \sum_{i \in J} n_i + \sum_{i \in J-1} n_i + \sum_{i \notin K} n_i \\ &\geq 2 + 2(m-1) + (b+2)(m-1) + b(l-2m+1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $k_1 \geq (4-b)m + l(b-1) - 2$ and so,

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &\geq (4-b)\frac{l+1}{2} + l(b-1) - 2 && \text{since } m \leq (l+1)/2 \\ &= l(1+b/2) - b/2 \\ &\geq (b+2)(1+b/2) - b/2 && \text{since } l \geq b+2 \\ &= b(b-1)/2 + 2b + 2 \\ &\geq 2b + 8 && \text{since } b \geq 4. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the fact that $k_1 < 2b+8$. Next we prove item (3). Assume that $k_1 \leq (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$ and $l > r_0$. Suppose there exists $\alpha_{n_1 \dots n_l} \neq 0$ with $n_1, \dots, n_l \geq \nu$ and $|n_1, \dots, n_l| = l + k_1$. We will prove that $n_1, \dots, n_l$ fulfill the conditions of Lemma A.4. The first one follows from the fact that

$$l > r_0 \Rightarrow l - 1 \geq \frac{(\nu-1)(b^{j_0}-1)}{b-1} \Rightarrow (l-1)(b-1) \geq (\nu-1)(b^{j_0}-1),$$

and so

$$(l-1)b + \nu \geq (\nu-1)b^{j_0} + l \geq k_1 + l = \sum_{i=0}^{l} n_i, \tag{A.2}$$

since $k_1 \leq (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$. If $i \geq 2$ and $n_i < b$, then necessarily $n_{i-1} \geq (\nu-1)b+2$, since $\alpha_{n_{i-1}n_i} = 0$ for $2 \leq n_{i-1} < (\nu-1)b+2$ and $n_i < b$. So, condition (2) holds. Finally, if $\nu = 2$, $i \geq 3$, $n_i < b$ and $n_{i-1} \leq 2b-2$, then necessarily $n_{i-2} \geq 2b-1$, since $\alpha_{n_{i-2}n_{i-1}n_i} = 0$ otherwise. This establishes condition (3). From Lemma A.4 it follows now that $n_1 = \nu$ and $n_i = b$ for $i > 1$. Hence,

$$l + k_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i = (l-1)b + \nu,$$

and so $k_1 = (l-1)b - l + \nu \geq (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$, where the inequality follows from (A.2). Since, by hypothesis $k_1 \leq (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$, we conclude that

$$k_1 = (\nu-1)b^{j_0} \quad \text{and} \quad l = \frac{(\nu-1)b^{j_0} + b - \nu}{b-1} = r_0 + 1.$$

This finishes the proof. □

Lemma A.6. *Suppose that for each $a \geq 1$ and $j, k \geq 0$ there exists $i \geq 1$ such that $\alpha_{k+ia}(X^{j+i}) = 0$. Let $j_0 \geq 1$ and $b \geq \nu$ be integers. Set $\rho_0 = r_{j_0}(b)$ and $\rho_1 = r_{j_0+1}(b)$. When $j_0 \geq 2$ we also write $\rho_{-1} = r_{j_0-1}(b)$. Assume that*

1. *$\alpha_{\rho_0+1}(X^{j_0}) \neq 0$,*
2. *$\alpha_l(X^{j_0}) = 0$ for all $l \leq \rho_0$,*
3. *$\gamma_s^{(l)} = \delta_{ls}\,\mathsf{ev}_0$ for all $l > \rho_0$ and $s < l + (\nu-1)b^{j_0-1}$,*
4. *$\alpha_{1k} = 0$ for $2 \leq k \leq (\nu-1)b^{j_0-1}$,*
5. *$\alpha_{ij} = 0$ for $j < b$ and $2 \leq i \leq 1 + (\nu-1)b$,*
6. *If $\nu = 2$, then $\alpha_{ijk} = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq 2b-2$, $j \leq 2b-2$ and $k < b$,*
7. *For $j_0 \geq 2$, we have $\gamma_{\rho_0+1}^{(\rho_{-1}+1)} = \alpha_\nu \circ \alpha_b^{\rho_{-1}} + \alpha_1 \circ \alpha_{(\nu-1)b^{j_0-1}+1}$.*

Then,

8. *$\alpha_l(X^j) = 0$ for all $l \leq \rho_1$ and $j > j_0$,*
9. *$\gamma_s^{(l)} = \delta_{ls}\,\mathsf{ev}_0$ for all $l > \rho_0$ and $s < l + (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$,*
10. *$\alpha_{1k} = 0$ for $2 \leq k \leq (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$,*
11. *$\gamma_{\rho_1+1}^{(\rho_0+1)} = \alpha_\nu \circ \alpha_b^{\rho_0} + \alpha_1 \circ \alpha_{(\nu-1)b^{j_0}+1}$,*

(12) *For* $j_0 \geq 2$, *we have*

$$\gamma_{\rho_0+1}^{(\rho_{-1}+1)} = \alpha_\nu \circ \alpha_b^{\rho_{-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\rho_1+1}(X^{j_0+1}) = \alpha_{\rho_0+1}(X^{j_0})\gamma_{\rho_1+1}^{(\rho_0+1)}(X).$$

Proof. By items (2) and (3) we can apply Lemma A.2 with $a = (\nu-1)b^{j_0-1}$ and the same j_0 and ρ_0. Hence,

$$\alpha_l(X^{j+i}) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \geq 0,\ l \leq \rho_0 + i(\nu-1)b^{j_0-1} \text{ and } j \geq j_0.$$

In particular $\alpha_l(X^{j+1}) = 0$ for $l \leq \rho_0 + (\nu-1)b^{j_0-1}$ and $j \geq j_0$. From this and items (3) and (4), it follows that in order to prove items (8)–(10), it suffices to prove by induction on $k = (\nu-1)b^{j_0-1}+1, \dots, (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{1k} = 0, \\ &\alpha_{\rho_0+k}(X^{j+1}) = 0 \qquad \text{for } j \geq j_0, \\ &\gamma_s^{(l)} = \delta_{ls}\,\mathsf{ev}_0 \qquad \text{for } l > \rho_0 \text{ and } s < l+k \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

By the discussion above and conditions (3) and (4), we know that (A.3) is true for $k = (\nu-1)b^{j_0-1}$. Suppose it is true for $k \leq k_1$, where k_1 is a fix integer satisfying

$$(\nu-1)b^{j_0-1} \leq k_1 < (\nu-1)b^{j_0}.$$

In order to perform the inductive step it suffices to apply Lemma A.3 with $a = k_1$ and the same j_0 and ρ_0. Conditions (1) and (2) of that lemma are the corresponding assumptions of the present lemma and condition (3) follows from the inductive hypothesis. The fact that condition (4) is also satisfied (i.e. $\gamma_{l+k_1}^{(l)} = \alpha_1 \circ \alpha_{k_1+1}$ for all $l > \rho_0$) follows from item (3) of Lemma A.5, which applies thanks to the inductive hypothesis and assumptions (5) and (6). Item (11) also follows from item (3) of Lemma A.5. Finally, the first assertion of item (12) follows from items (7) and (10), since clearly $(\nu-1)b^{j_0-1}+1 \leq (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$. The second assertion is a direct consequence of the equality

$$\alpha_{\rho_1+1}(X^{j_0+1}) = \sum_{l=0}^{\rho_1+1} \alpha_l(X^{j_0})\gamma_{\rho_1+1}^{(l)}(X)$$

and items (2) and (9), since $\rho_1 + 1 < l + (\nu-1)b^{j_0}$ for all $l > \rho_0 + 1$. □

Lemma A.7. *Suppose* $\nu = 2$ *and* $b \geq 4$. *Assume that for each integer a satisfying* $b \leq a < 2b-3$ *and* $u \geq 1$ *there is an* i *such that* $\alpha_{b+ia+2}(X^{iu+2}) = 0$. *Write* $\alpha_k(X) = \sum_{i\geq 0} q_{ik}X^i$. *If*

1. $\alpha_{b+2}(X^2) \neq 0$,
2. $\alpha_k(X^2) = 0$ *for* $k \leq b+1$,
3. $\alpha_{1k} = 0$ *for* $2 \leq k \leq b$,
4. $q_{1k} = 0$ *for* $k < b$,

then $\alpha_{ijk} = 0$ *for* $2 \leq i \leq 2b-2$, $j \leq 2b-2$ *and* $k < b$.

Proof. In order to prove the lemma we will need to establish some auxiliary facts. We first prove that

$$\alpha_{ij} = 0 \qquad \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq b+1 \text{ and } j < b. \tag{A.4}$$

This is immediate when $j = 1$, since $\alpha_1 = \mathsf{ev}_0$ and $\alpha_i(1) = 0$. Thus, we can assume $j > 1$. By item (2) and Lemma A.1,

$$\alpha_h(X^r) = 0 \quad \text{for all } h \leq b+1 \text{ and } r \geq 2 \tag{A.5}$$

and so $\alpha_{ij}(X^r)=0$ for $r\ge 2$. Since also $\alpha_{ij}(1)=0$, we are reduced to prove that $\alpha_{ij}(X)=0$. By item (3) and the fact that $\alpha_1=\mathsf{ev}_0$,

$$0=\alpha_{1j}(X)=\sum_{i\ge 0} q_{ij}\alpha_1(X^i)=q_{0j}.$$

Hence, by item (4) we have $\alpha_j(X)\in X^2k[X]$. Thus, applying (A.5) with i instead of h, we obtain $\alpha_{ij}(X)=0$. We now prove that

$$\gamma_s^{(l)}=\delta_{ls}\,\mathsf{ev}_0 \qquad \text{for } l\ge b \text{ and } s<l+b. \tag{A.6}$$

Since

$$\gamma_s^{(l+1)}=\sum_{j=1}^{s}\alpha_j\circ\gamma_{s-j}^{(l)}\ ,$$

it will be sufficient to prove this for $l=b$ and $s<2b$. But using that $\alpha_{1j}=\alpha_{j1}=0$ for $2\le j\le b$ and $\alpha_{ij}=0$ for $2\le i\le b$ and $j<b$, it is easy to see that

$$\gamma_s^{(b)}=\sum_{|i_1,\dots,i_b|=s}\alpha_{i_1\cdots i_b}=\delta_{bs}\,\mathsf{ev}_0\,.$$

Finally, we also need to check that

$$\alpha_{1k}=0 \qquad \text{for } k=2,\dots,2b-3. \tag{A.7}$$

By item (3) we must show that

$$\alpha_{1k}=0 \qquad \text{for } k=b+1,\dots,2b-3.$$

To check this it suffices to prove by induction on $k=b,\dots,2b-3$, that

$$\alpha_{1k}=0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \gamma_s^{(l)}=\delta_{ls}\,\mathsf{ev}_0 \tag{A.8}$$

for $l>b+1$ and $s<l+k$. By item (3) and (A.6), we know that (A.8) is true for $k=b$. Suppose it is true for $k\le k_1$, where $b\le k_1<2b-3$. In order to perform the inductive step it suffices to apply Lemma A.3 with $a=k_1$, $\rho_0=b+1$ and $j_0=2$. Conditions (1) and (2) of that lemma are the corresponding assumptions of the present lemma and condition (3) follows from the inductive hypothesis. The fact that condition (4) is also satisfied (i.e. $\gamma_{l+k_1}^{(l)}=\alpha_1\circ\alpha_{k_1+1}$ for all $l>b+1$), follows from item (2) of Lemma A.5, which applies thanks to the inductive hypothesis and (A.4).

We now are ready to prove the thesis. By item(2) of Theorem 2.1, item (2) and Lemma A.1, we only need to check that

$$\alpha_{ijk}(X)=0 \quad \text{for } 2\le i\le 2b-2,\ j\le 2b-2 \text{ and } k<b.$$

For this will be sufficient to prove that

$$\alpha_i(X^r)=0 \qquad\qquad \text{for } i\le 2b-2 \text{ and } r\ge 3, \tag{A.9}$$

$$\alpha_{jk}(X)\in X^3k[X] \qquad\qquad \text{for } j\le 2b-2 \text{ and } k<b. \tag{A.10}$$

From (A.6) and item (2), it follows that the hypothesis of Lemma A.2 are satisfied with $\rho_0=b+1$, $j_0=2$ and $a=b$. Thus (A.9) is true. We next prove (A.10). Let $k<b$ and $j\le 2b-2$. Since $q_{0k}=\alpha_{1k}(X)=0$ for $k\le b$, from (A.9) we get

$$\alpha_{jk}(X)=\sum_{r\ge 1}q_{rk}\alpha_j(X^r)=q_{1k}\alpha_j(X)+q_{2k}\alpha_j(X^2).$$

But $q_{1k}=0$ for $k<b$ by item (4). Thus $\alpha_{jk}(X)=q_{2k}\alpha_j(X^2)$, and so we are reduced to prove that $\alpha_j(X^2)\in X^3k[X]$. Now,

$$\alpha_j(X^2)=\sum_{l=2}^{j}\alpha_l(X)\gamma_j^{(l)}(X)=\sum_{l=2}^{\min(j,b-1)}\alpha_l(X)\gamma_j^{(l)}(X), \tag{A.11}$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\alpha_1(X) = 0$, and the second one from the fact that $\gamma_j^{(l)} = \delta_{jl}\,\mathsf{ev}_0$ for $b \le l \le j \le 2b-2$, by (A.6). Since $q_{0l} = q_{1l} = 0$, we know that

$$\alpha_l(X) \in X^2k[X] \quad \text{for } l < b. \tag{A.12}$$

So, if we prove that $\gamma_j^{(l)}(X) \in Xk[X]$ for $j \le 2b-2$ and $2 \le l \le \min(j, b-1)$, the fact that $\alpha_j(X^2) \in X^3k[X]$ follows. Clearly $\gamma_l^{(l)}(X) = 0$. So we can assume $j > l$. By definition

$$\gamma_j^{(l)}(X) = \sum_{|n_1,\dots,n_l|=j} \alpha_{n_1\dots n_l}(X).$$

By (A.7) we know that $\alpha_{1k} = 0$ for $1 < k < 2b-2$. Thus, if $\alpha_{n_1\dots n_l}(X) \ne 0$, then there cannot be any $n_i = 1$. Write

$$\alpha_{n_3\dots n_l}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{u} p_i X^i \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{n_2\dots n_l}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{v} p_i' X^i.$$

To finish the proof we will use that

$$\alpha_n(X^2k[X])) \subseteq X^2k[X] \qquad \text{for } 2 \le n \le 2b-2, \tag{A.13}$$

which follows immediately from the following facts:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_n(X^r) = 0 \text{ for all } r > 2 && \text{by (A.9)},\\ &\alpha_n(X^2) \in X^2k[X] && \text{by (A.11) and (A.12)}. \end{aligned}$$

We consider two cases: If $n_2 < b$, then by the fact that $\alpha_{n_2}(1) = 0$ and equalities (A.12), (A.13),

$$\alpha_{n_1\dots n_l}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{u} p_i \alpha_{n_1 n_2}(X^i) \in X^2k[X].$$

If $b \le n_2 \le 2b-2$, then $n_1 < b-1$, and so by the fact that $\alpha_{n_1}(1) = 0$, and equalities (A.12), (A.13),

$$\alpha_{n_1\dots n_l}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{v} p_i' \alpha_{n_1}(X^i) \in X^2k[X],$$

as desired. ☐

Lemma A.8. *Suppose there exists m such that $\alpha_k = 0$ for all $k \ge m$. Recall that $\alpha_k(X) = \sum_i q_{ik}X^i$. Let $u \in \{1,2\}$. Then the following facts hold:*

1. $\alpha_l(X^u) = 0$ *for* $l < \nu^u$,
2. $\gamma_s^{(l)} = \delta_{ls}\,\mathsf{ev}_0$ *for* $l \ge \nu^u$ *and* $s < l + (\nu-1)\nu^{u-1}$,
3. $\alpha_{1k} = 0$ *for* $2 \le k \le (\nu-1)\nu^{u-1}$,
4. $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ *for* $j < \nu$ *and* $2 \le i \le 1 + (\nu-1)\nu$,
5. *If* $\nu = 2$ *then* $\alpha_{ijk} = 0$ *for* $2 \le i \le 2\nu-2$, $j \le 2\nu-2$ *and* $k < \nu$,
6. *For* $u \ge 2$, *we have* $\gamma_{\nu^u}^{(\nu^{u-1})} = \alpha_\nu^{\nu^{u-1}} + \alpha_1 \circ \alpha_{(\nu-1)\nu^{u-1}+1}$
7. $\alpha_{\nu^2}(X^2) = q_{1\nu} = q_{0,(\nu-1)\nu+1} = 0$.

Proof. By hypothesis there exists u_0 such that $\alpha_{\nu^{u_0}}(X^{u_0}) = 0$ and $\alpha_{\nu^u}(X^u) \ne 0$ for $1 \le u < u_0$. By the discussion preceding Lemma A.5 we know that $u_0 \ge 2$. Next we prove by induction on $1 \le u < u_0$ that items (1)–(6) are valid for $1 \le u \le u_0$. Then we will see that $u_0 = 2$ and $q_{1\nu} = q_{0,(\nu-1)\nu+1} = 0$. When $u = 1$ item (6) is empty and items (1), (3) and (4) are satisfied, since $\alpha_1(X) = 0$, $\alpha_l = 0$ for $1 < l < \nu$ and $\alpha_{i1} = 0$ for all $i > 1$. Item (5) is a direct consequence of item (4). Finally, by item (1) of Lemma A.5 we have $\gamma_{l+k}^{(l)} = \alpha_{1,k+1} = 0$ for $1 \le k < \nu-1$ and $l \ge \nu$, from which item (2) follows easily. Suppose the result is valid for a fixed $u < u_0$. We will apply Lemma A.6 with $j_0 = u$ and $b = \nu$. Note that in this case $\rho_0 = \nu^u - 1$, $\rho_1 = \nu^{u+1} - 1$ and $\rho_{-1} = \nu^{u-1} - 1$ (if $u \geq 2$). Item (1) of Lemma A.6 is valid by the definition of u_0 and items (2)–(7) are items (1)–(6) above. To perform the inductive step it suffices to note that items (4) and (5) above do not depend on u, and that items (8)–(11) of Lemma A.6 implies items (1), (2), (3) and (6) above with $u + 1$ instead of u. Hence items (1)–(6) are valid for $1 \leq u \leq u_0$. Moreover, item (12) of Lemma A.6 gives

$$\gamma_{\nu^u}^{(\nu^{u-1})} = \alpha_\nu^{\nu^{u-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\nu^{u+1}}(X^{u+1}) = \alpha_{\nu^u}(X^u)\gamma_{\nu^{u+1}}^{(\nu^u)}(X), \tag{A.14}$$

for $2 \leq u < u_0$. Since $\alpha_{\nu^{u_0}}(X^{u_0}) = 0$ and $\alpha_{\nu^{u_0-1}}(X^{u_0-1}) \neq 0$, the last equality yields

$$\gamma_{\nu^{u_0}}^{(\nu^{u_0-1})}(X) = 0. \tag{A.15}$$

In the sequel we are going to use the equality

$$q_{0k} = \sum_i q_{ik}\, \mathsf{ev}_0(X^i) = \alpha_{1k}(X) \qquad \text{for } k \geq 1. \tag{A.16}$$

By this equality and item (3) with $u = 2$, we have $q_{0\nu} = 0$. Moreover item (1) (also with $u = 2$) implies $\alpha_l(X^2) = 0$ for all $l \leq \nu$. So,

$$\alpha_\nu(X^i) = \sum_{l=1}^{\nu} \alpha_l(X^2)\gamma_\nu^{(l)}(X^{i-2}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \geq 2.$$

Thus, for $u < u_0$,

$$\alpha_\nu^{\nu^u}(X) = \sum_{i>0} q_{i\nu}\alpha_\nu^{\nu^u-1}(X^i) = q_{1\nu}\alpha_\nu^{\nu^u-1}(X) = \cdots = q_{1\nu}^{\nu^u-1}\alpha_\nu(X). \tag{A.17}$$

Hence, by item (6) with $u = u_0$ and equalities (A.15), (A.16) and (A.17),

$$\begin{aligned} q_{1\nu}^{\nu^{u_0-1}-1}\alpha_\nu(X) + q_{0,(\nu-1)\nu^{u_0-1}+1} &= \alpha_\nu^{\nu^{u_0-1}}(X) + \alpha_1\circ\alpha_{(\nu-1)\nu^{u_0-1}+1}(X) \\ &= \gamma_{\nu^{u_0}}^{\nu^{u_0-1}}(X) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\deg(\alpha_\nu(X)) > 0$ (because $q_{0\nu} = 0$ and $\alpha_\nu(X) \neq 0$), this implies

$$q_{0,(\nu-1)\nu^{u_0-1}+1} = q_{1\nu} = 0. \tag{A.18}$$

Now, we claim that $u_0 = 2$ (that is $\alpha_{\nu^2}(X^2) = 0$). In fact, by (A.14), (A.17) and (A.18),

$$\alpha_{\nu^2}(X^2) = \alpha_\nu(X)\gamma_{\nu^2}^{(\nu)}(X) = \alpha_\nu(X)\alpha_\nu^\nu(X) = \alpha_\nu(X)^2 q_{1\nu}^{\nu-1} = 0,$$

as we want. □

Lemma A.9. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma A.8, we have:*

$$q_{0k} = q_{1k} = 0 \quad \textit{for all } k.$$

Proof. We are going to prove by induction on d that for all $d \geq \nu$, the following statements are true

$$\alpha_k(X^2) = 0 \qquad \text{for } k \leq 1 + (\nu-1)(d+1). \tag{A.19}$$

$$\alpha_{1k} = 0 \qquad \text{for } 2 \leq k \leq (\nu-1)d + 1. \tag{A.20}$$

$$q_{1k} = 0 \qquad \text{for } k \leq d. \tag{A.21}$$

This will be finish the proof of the lemma since $q_{0k} = \alpha_{1k}(X)$ by equality (A.16). Assume $d = \nu$. Since $\alpha_1 = \mathsf{ev}_0$ and $\alpha_k = 0$ for $2 \leq k < \nu$, we have $q_{1k} = 0$ for $k < \nu$. Combining this with Lemma A.8 we obtain (A.21). Equality (A.19) follows from items (1) and (7) of Lemma A.8. It remains to check that equality (A.20) holds. For $2 \le k \le (\nu-1)\nu$ this follows from item (3) of Lemma A.8. To finish we must see that $\alpha_{1,(\nu-1)\nu+1}(X^r) = 0$ for all $r \ge 0$. For $r=0$ this follows from item (2) of Theorem 2.1 and for $r=1$, from item (7) of Lemma A.8 and the fact that $q_{0,(\nu-1)\nu+1} = \alpha_{1,(\nu-1)\nu+1}(X)$. Finally, for $r \ge 2$,

$$\alpha_{1,(\nu-1)\nu+1}(X^r) = \sum_{l=1}^{(\nu-1)\nu+1} \alpha_{1l}(X)\alpha_1(\gamma^{(l)}_{(\nu-1)\nu+1}(X^{r-1})) = 0,$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\alpha_{1l}(X) = 0$ for $1 \le l \le (\nu-1)\nu+1$. Suppose that equalities (A.19), (A.20) and (A.21) are true for d. We claim that if $\nu = 2$, then

$$\gamma^{(l)}_{l+h} = \delta_{0h} ev_0 \qquad \text{for } l \ge 2 \text{ and } h \le d.$$

For $h=0$ this is immediate. Assume $h>0$. Since $\alpha_{k1} = 0$ for all $k \ge 2$ and $\alpha_{1k} = 0$ for $2 \le k \le d+1$, we have

$$\gamma^{(l)}_{l+h} = \sum_{\substack{|n_1,\dots,n_l| = l+h \\ n_1,\dots,n_l \ge 2}} \alpha_{n_1\dots n_l}.$$

Because of $h \le d$, each one of the indices $(n_1,\dots,n_l)$ in the above sum satisfies $2 \le n_j \le d < r_2(d)$ for all j. Since, by Theorem 2.1, Lemma A.1 and equalities (A.19), (A.20) and (A.21),

$$\alpha_h(1) = 0 \qquad \text{for } h \ge 2, \tag{A.22}$$

$$\alpha_h(X^j) = 0 \qquad \text{for } h \le d+1 \text{ and } j \ge 2, \tag{A.23}$$

$$\alpha_{hl}(X) = 0 \qquad \text{for } h \le d+1 \text{ and } l \le d, \tag{A.24}$$

the claim is true. Hence, when $\nu = 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{d+3}(X^2) &= \alpha_2(X)\gamma^{(2)}_{d+3}(X) \\ &= \alpha_2(X)\big(\alpha_{1,d+2}(X) + \alpha_{2,d+1}(X)\big) \\ &= \alpha_2(X)\big(\alpha_{1,d+2}(X) + q_{1,d+1}\alpha_2(X)\big), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (A.24) and the fact that $\alpha_1 = \mathsf{ev}_0$, and the last one from (A.22) and (A.23). Suppose $\alpha_{d+3}(X^2) = 0$ (that is, equality (A.19) is valid for $d+1$). Then $\alpha_{1,d+2}(X) = q_{1,d+1} = 0$, since $\deg(\alpha_2(X)) > 0$. In particular condition (A.21) is satisfied for $d+1$. Moreover,

$$\alpha_{1,d+2}(X^i) = \sum_{l=1}^{d+2} \alpha_{1l}(X)\alpha_1 \circ \gamma^{(l)}_{d+2}(X^{i-1}) = \sum_{l=1}^{d+1} \alpha_{1l}(X)\alpha_1 \circ \gamma^{(l)}_{d+2}(X^{i-1}) = 0,$$

for all $i \ge 1$, where the last equality follows from the fact that $\alpha_{11}(X) = 0$ and equality (A.20) for d. Since, by item (2) of Theorem 2.1, we also have $\alpha_{1,d+2}(1) = 0$, condition (A.20) is also valid for $d+1$. Hence in the case that $\nu = 2$ and $\alpha_{d+3}(X^2) = 0$, we are done. For the rest of the proof we assume that $\nu \ge 2$ and $\alpha_{d+3}(X^2) \ne 0$ if $\nu = 2$. For all h, let $r_h = r_h(d+1)$. Note that $r_1 = \nu - 1$ and $r_2 = (\nu-1)(d+2)$. By hypothesis there exists h_0 such that $\alpha_{r_{h_0}+1}(X^{h_0}) = 0$ and $\alpha_{r_h+1}(X^h) \ne 0$ for $1 \le h < h_0$. By the discussion preceding Lemma A.5 we know that $h_0 \ge 2$. Next we prove by induction on $1 \le h < h_0$ that

1. $\alpha_l(X^h) = 0$ for all $l \le r_h$,
2. $\gamma^{(l)}_s = \delta_{ls}\,\mathsf{ev}_0$ for all $l > r_h$ and $s < l + (\nu-1)(d+1)^{h-1}$,
3. $\alpha_{1k} = 0$ for $2 \le k \le (\nu-1)(d+1)^{h-1}$,
4. $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ for $j \le d$ and $2 \le i \le 1 + (\nu-1)(d+1)$,

(5) If $\nu = 2$, then $\alpha_{ijk} = 0$ for $2 \le i \le 2d$, $j \le 2d$ and $k \le d$,

(6) For $h \ge 2$, we have $\gamma_{r_h+1}^{(r_{h-1}+1)} = \alpha_\nu \circ \alpha_{d+1}^{r_{h-1}} + \alpha_1 \circ \alpha_{(\nu-1)(d+1)^{h-1}+1}$.

for $1 \le h \le h_0$. When $h = 1$, items (1), (2) and (3) do not depend on d and they follow from items (1), (2) and (3) of Lemma A.8, respectively. Since item (6) does not apply, we only need to verify items (4) and (5). Note that by item (2) of Theorem 2.1, Lemma A.1 and equality (A.19), we have

$$\alpha_k(X^s) = 0 \qquad \text{for } 2 \le k \le 1 + (\nu-1)(d+1) \text{ and } s \ne 1. \tag{A.25}$$

This immediately gives

$$\alpha_{ij}(X^s) = 0 \qquad \text{for } 2 \le j \le d \text{ and } s \ne 1.$$

But, by (A.21) and (A.25)

$$\alpha_{ij}(X) = \sum_{s \ge 0} q_{sj}\alpha_i(X^s) = q_{1j}\alpha_i(X) = 0,$$

for $j \le d$ and $2 \le i \le 1 + (\nu-1)(d+1)$. So,

$$\alpha_{ij} = 0 \qquad \text{for } j \le d \text{ and } 2 \le i \le 1 + (\nu-1)(d+1),$$

since clearly $\alpha_{i1} = 0$ for $i \ge 2$. This establishes item (4). Suppose $\nu = 2$. If $d < 3$, then item (5) follows from item (4), and if $d \ge 3$, from Lemma A.7 with $b = d+1$, which applies because condition (1) is satisfied since $\alpha_{d+3}(X^2) \ne 0$ by assumption and conditions (2), (3) and (4) are equalities (A.19), (A.20) and (A.21). Assume that items (1)–(6) are valid for a fix $h < h_0$. We will apply Lemma A.6 with $j_0 = h$ and $b = d+1$. Note that in this case $\rho_0 = r_h$, $\rho_1 = r_{h+1}$ and $\rho_{-1} = r_{h-1}$ (if $h \ge 2$). Item (1) of Lemma A.6 is valid by the definition of h_0 and items (2)–(7) are items (1)–(6) above. To perform the inductive step it suffices to note that items (4) and (5) above do not depend on h, and that items (8)–(11) of Lemma A.6 imply items (1), (2), (3) and (6) above for $h+1$ instead of h. So, we have established items (1)–(6) above for $h+1$. Indeed, item (9) of Lemma A.6 gives the following equality

$$\gamma_s^{(l)} = \delta_{ls}\,\mathsf{ev}_0 \qquad \text{for all } l > r_h \text{ and } s < l + (\nu-1)(d+1)^h, \tag{A.26}$$

which is stronger that item (2) above for h and also for $h+1$. Note that (A.26) for $h = 1$ implies $\gamma_{r_2+1}^{(l)}(X) = 0$ for $l > r_1 + 1 = \nu$. Hence,

$$\alpha_{r_2+1}(X^2) = \sum_{l=1}^{r_2+1} \alpha_l(X)\gamma_{r_2+1}^{(l)}(X) = \alpha_\nu(X)\gamma_{r_2+1}^{(\nu)}(X), \tag{A.27}$$

since $\alpha_l(X) = 0$ for $l < \nu$. Moreover, by equality (A.25), we have

$$\alpha_\nu(X^s) = \alpha_{d+1}(X^s) = 0 \qquad \text{for } s \ne 1,$$

and so, arguing as in the proof of equality (A.17), we obtain

$$\alpha_\nu \circ \alpha_{d+1}^l(X) = \alpha_\nu(X) q_{1,d+1}^l \quad \text{for all } l \ge 1. \tag{A.28}$$

By item (6) above for $h = h_0$ and equality (A.28), we have

$$\gamma_{r_{h_0}+1}^{(r_{h_0-1}+1)}(X) = \alpha_\nu(X) q_{1,d+1}^{r_{h_0-1}} + \alpha_1 \circ \alpha_{(\nu-1)(d+1)^{h_0-1}+1}(X). \tag{A.29}$$

We claim that $\alpha_{r_2+1}(X^2) = 0$ (Combining this with item (1) above for $h = 2$, we obtain (A.19) for $d+1$). Assume on the contrary that $\alpha_{r_2+1}(X^2) \ne 0$ (which implies $h_0 \ge 3$). By (A.28) and item (12) of Lemma A.6 with $j_0 = 2$ and $b = d+1$ (item (1) of this lemma is satisfied since $\alpha_{r_2+1}(X^2) \ne 0$, and items (2)–(7) are items (1)–(6) above for $h = 2$), we have

$$\gamma_{r_2+1}^{(r_1+1)}(X) = \alpha_\nu \circ \alpha_{d+1}^{r_1}(X) = \alpha_\nu(X) q_{1,d+1}^{r_1}. \tag{A.30}$$

Combining this with (A.27), we obtain $\alpha_{r_2+1}(X^2) = \alpha_\nu(X)^2 q_{1,d+1}^{r_1}$, which implies $q_{1,d+1} \neq 0$. On the other hand, by item (12) of Lemma A.6 with $j_0 = h_0 - 1$ and $b = d+1$, we have

$$\alpha_{r_{h_0}+1}(X^{h_0}) = \alpha_{r_{h_0-1}+1}(X^{h_0-1})\gamma_{r_{h_0}+1}^{(r_{h_0-1}+1)}(X).$$

Since $\alpha_{r_{h_0}+1}(X^{h_0}) = 0$ and $\alpha_{r_{h_0-1}+1}(X^{h_0-1}) \neq 0$, this and equality (A.29) imply

$$0 = \alpha_\nu(X) q_{1,d+1}^{r_{h_0-1}} + \alpha_{1,(\nu-1)(d+1)^{h_0-1}+1}(X).$$

Since $deg(\alpha_\nu(X)) > 0$ and $\alpha_{1,(\nu-1)(d+1)^{h_0-1}+1}(X) \in k$, this yields $q_{1,d+1} = 0$, which contradicts the fact that $q_{1,d+1} \neq 0$. This proves the claim. Thus $\alpha_{r_2+1}(X^2) = 0$ or, equivalently, $h_0 = 2$. This, together with equality (A.27), gives $\gamma_{r_2+1}^{(r_1+1)}(X) = 0$. Since $deg(\alpha_\nu(X)) > 0$, from equality (A.29) it follows that

$$q_{1,d+1} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{1,(\nu-1)(d+1)+1}(X) = 0.$$

Combining the first equality with (A.21) for d, we get (A.21) for $d+1$. Finally, by item (2) of Theorem 2.1, we know that $\alpha_{1,(\nu-1)(d+1)+1}(1) = 0$, and for $r \geq 2$,

$$\alpha_{1,(\nu-1)(d+1)+1}(X^r) = \sum_{l=1}^{(\nu-1)(d+1)+1} \alpha_{1l}(X)\alpha_1(\gamma_{(\nu-1)(d+1)+1}^{(l)}(X^{r-1})) = 0,$$

where the last equality follows from item (3) above for $h = 2$ and the fact that

$$\alpha_{11}(X) = \alpha_{1,(\nu-1)(d+1)+1}(X) = 0.$$

All this, together with item (3) for $h = 2$, yields equality (A.20) for $d+1$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Item (2) follows from item (1) using that s is a twisting map if and only if $\tau \circ s \circ \tau$ is, where τ denotes the flip. we now prove item (1). Since $q_{i0} = q_{i1} = 0$ for all i, we have $\alpha_0(X) = \alpha_1(X) = 0$. An inductive argument using formula (2.1) and the fact that $\alpha_0(1) = 0$ show that $\alpha_0 = 0$. Then, by Remark 2.2, we know that $\alpha_1 = \mathtt{ev}_0$. So, we can apply Lemma A.9 in order to obtain that $q_{0j} = q_{1j} = 0$ for all $j \geq 0$, as we want. □

References

[C-S-V] A. Cap, H. Schichl and J. Vanžura *On twisted tensoir products of algebras*, Communications in Algebra, Vol 23 (1995) 4701–4735.

[Ca] P. cartier *Produits tensorieles tordus*, Exposé au Séminaire des groupes quantiques de'l École Normale Supérieure, Paris (1991-1992).

[C-I-M-Z] S. Cænepel, B. Ion, G. Militarú, S. Zhu *The factorisation problem and smah biproducts of algebras an coalgebras*, Algebr. Represent. Theory, Vol 3 (2000) 14–42.

[G-G] J. A. Guccione and J. J. Guccione *Hochschild Homology ofTwisted Tensor Products*, K-Theory, vol 18 (4) (1999) 363-400.

[Ka] C. Kassel *Quantum groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol 155 Springer-Verlag, New Xork (1995).

[Ma] S. Majid *Algebras and Hopf algebras in braided categories*, Advances in Hopf algebras, Marcel Dekker (1993).

[Mo] S. Montgomery *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol 82 AMS Providence Rhode Island (1993).

[Tam] D. Tambara *The coendomorphism bialgebra of an algebra*, J. Fac Sci. Univ. Tokio Sect. IA Math, vol 34 (1990) 425–456.

[VD-VK] A. Van Daele and S. Van Keer *The Xang Baxter and the pentagon equation*, Compositio Math., Vol 91 (1994) 201–221.

Departamento de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Pabellón 1 - Ciudad Universitaria, (1428) Buenos Aires, Argentina.
E-mail address: `vander@dm.uba.ar`

Departamento de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Pabellón 1 - Ciudad Universitaria, (1428) Buenos Aires, Argentina.
E-mail address: `jjgucci@dm.uba.ar`

Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú - Instituto de Matemática y Ciencias Afines.
E-mail address: `cvalqui@pucp.edu.pe`